

THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.

APRIL 1959

Contributors Include

HOLY COMMUNION

JOHN C. BOWMER, M.A., B.D.

RUPERT E. DAVIES, M.A., B.D.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE, M.A., B.D.

A. S. GREGORY, M.A.

PERCY SCOTT, B.D., D.THEOL.

VINCENT TAYLOR, D.D., PH.D., F.B.A.

E. L. ALLEN, PH.D., D.D.

R. NEWTON FLEW, M.A., D.D.

PERCIVAL HADFIELD, M.A., B.D., PH.D., F.R.A.I.

BERNARD E. JONES, M.A., B.D.

JAMES A. MICHIE, M.A.

E. BENSON PERKINS, M.A., LL.D.

JOHN STACEY, B.D.



THE EPWORTH PRESS

[FRANK H. CUMBERS]

25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1

Four Shillings and Sixpence Net

THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW
 is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35, City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

Contents

Editorial Comments by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	81	The Wisdom of Mark Rutherford by James A. Michie, M.A.	124
The New Testament Origins of Holy Communion by Vincent Taylor, D.D., PH.D., F.B.A.	84	Matthew the Apocalyptic Editor by P. Hadfield, M.A., B.D., PH.D., F.R.A.I.	128
The History of Holy Communion by Rupert E. Davies, M.A., B.D.	91	The Character of John Wyclif by John Stacey, B.D.	133
The History of Holy Communion in Methodism by John C. Bowmer, M.A., B.D.	97	Barth and Berdyaev by E. L. Allen, PH.D., D.D.	136
The Theology of Holy Communion by Percy Scott, B.D., D.THEOL.	103	Jeremy Taylor on Gambling by E. Benson Perkins, M.A., LL.D.	140
The Structure of the Service by A. Raymond George, M.A., B.D.	108	Recent Literature Edited by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	145
Communion Hymns by A. S. Gregory, M.A.	115	From My New Shelf by R. Newton Flew, M.A., D.D.	153
Three Men in a Boat: II by Bernard E. Jones, M.A., B.D.	121	Our Contributors	159

Ninety Years of Child Saving

Over 40,000 orphaned and needy girls and boys have been helped by the National Children's Home since it was founded by Dr Stephenson in 1869. Though social conditions have improved since then, there are still children in need and so the work must continue.

Contrary to a widespread misapprehension, the Home is not nationalized and it still depends on voluntary contributions. It is hoped, therefore, you will keep on helping.

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME

CHIEF OFFICES: 85 Highbury Park, London, N.5

Editorial Comments

HOLY COMMUNION

IN THE present generation there has been a new interest in and concern about the service of Holy Communion. Scholars have tried more thoroughly and intensely than their immediate predecessors did to understand and interpret it. Ministers have begun to speak and preach about it more than they used to. Congregations are more concerned about it, and there must now be a larger proportion of regular communicants in all the Churches than there was a generation ago. Even societies which are concerned with apparently quite other aspects of the Christian life, such as peace-making, sacred music, evangelism, and the relation of the Church to industry, are finding that this also makes its way into their thought and fellowship in a way which would not have happened fifty years ago.

No doubt all this is partly connected with our new interest in liturgy, biblical theology, the Church (especially Church unity), and the general relation between spirit and matter which we see in the bringing together of religion and the arts, religion and science, and religion and politics; but we believe it also goes back, independently of these things, to a deep need of the human spirit. 'The sacrament is appointed', said Robert Bruce, 'that we may get a better grip of Christ', and although it is possible for men to love and follow Him without making use of it, and many people have done so and still do, an increasing number find that Holy Communion is a supreme means of grace through which they receive the spiritual power of which they have been in so much need.

If we are to have a proper understanding of Holy Communion, it is necessary that we should investigate its origin, discover the intention of Jesus when He instituted it, learn how the Church throughout the ages has interpreted His words and deeds, and examine the form of service which we now use. Upon such subjects as these we have therefore invited a number of contributors to write, and what they have to say provides us with a basis which is essential for understanding.

There is, however, also something else to be said. When we think of all those whom God has called to be members of the Church, both in this and in other lands, we see that it is still true that there are 'not many wise after the flesh', and that God has chosen the weak and foolish things of the world to put to shame those that are strong and wise. Mercifully, a high I.Q. and leisure enough for the systematic study of Theology and Church History are not among the necessary qualifications for entering the Kingdom of God. It is highly necessary that these things should be intensively studied by some, but it is quite certain that they will not be deeply apprehended by all; and there will always be many simple, saintly souls who do not understand the explanations of scholars. But even though they do not grasp what the scholars have to say about Holy Communion, they will take the bread and the wine and find there heavenly food.

There is a good deal to be said for the idea that, whereas in preaching God approaches us mainly through our conscious mind, in the sacraments He approaches us mainly through our unconscious. At any rate it is clear that we can

receive Him in Holy Communion with only a minimum of understanding. Like so many actions, it has its effect even when much of its significance is not consciously perceived. We believe that it works like this because it is a piece of natural symbolism. This thought needs to be developed in order to make it clear, and we hope our readers will forgive us if we repeat (partly in quotation and partly in paraphrase) what we have previously written in another place.

The point of central significance in the service of Holy Communion is the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine. Other things are done, and they have their importance and necessary place, but it is the act of eating and drinking that which represents Christ which is the purpose of the service. That contains its central meaning; indeed, that gathers into one action the whole of its meaning.

What it means is that we unite ourselves with Christ and He unites Himself with us. On various occasions we use many different symbols of unity, but perhaps the most adequate symbol of the closest possible kind of union is that of eating. That which is eaten becomes a real part of one's self, enters into one's system and is incorporated into one's body, so that one's body and that which it consumes become inseparably joined. It is not surprising that this symbol is used in human love between men and women. They may even say, without realizing the significance of their words, that they could eat one another, and that is the very thing they do in symbol with a kiss. So in the service of Holy Communion we eat and drink that which represents Christ, and whether we consciously work out the significance of that act or not, what we mean by it is that we are joining ourselves into the closest possible union with Him.

It is a union with him in heart, for to unite one's self by eating is primarily to unite one's self in love. It is easy to see why this is so. The first person whom we learn to love is our mother, and the obvious way in which our love for her is stirred and nourished is that quite literally she gives us herself to eat. Thereafter, we never get away from the feeling that the right thing to do with those we love is to eat them. This feeling Christ uses for His great purpose. As we should expect, He draws our nature to Him right from its roots, its most elemental and primitive depths. He did so when a woman of the city, a sinner, was moved to kiss His feet; and again when He gave His disciples His flesh to eat. So it is entirely in place that at the Eucharist the Armenian priest 'takes the body in his hand and kisses it with tears', and that one of the prayers of St John Chrysostom should join together the kiss of the harlot and the eating of the communicant.

It is union with Him in will. Holy Communion has special reference to Christ's death, which was His supreme act of sacrifice to the Father, the giving of Himself in all completeness for the accomplishing of the Father's will. To unite ourselves to Him through the bread and wine is therefore to offer with Him our whole selves to God as the instruments for the fulfilling of His purposes. As Charles Wesley puts it:

*Thou art with all Thy members here;
In this tremendous mystery
We jointly before God appear
To offer up ourselves with Thee.*

It is union with Christ in mind, for the Cross is not only the way by which Christ saves us; it is an example left to us 'that we should follow his steps'. It is not only a unique act of God on our behalf; it is a way of life for us to follow, and gives our dedication a specific content. To join ourselves to the bread and wine which represent Christ crucified is therefore to join our minds to His mind. It is to assent to the fact that Christ's way with us men is to die for us while we are yet sinners, and to accept as our own way of life this method of love, of seeking men's good even though they be our enemies, and of persisting in our care for them even though it should result in our death.

It is a union with Christ in deed, a co-operating with Him in the purpose which He has in mind for us. That purpose is to transform each of us into His own likeness and to make all of us into one body, and part of the way to its fulfilment is the Holy Communion. Just as physical food enables our bodies to live and grow, so when we take this spiritual food we 'feed on it', as the Savoy Liturgy says, 'to our nourishment and growth in grace', and it becomes a means by which God transforms us into the sort of people He wills us to become. Moreover, the second part of His purpose also begins to be fulfilled, for Holy Communion is a corporate meal, and those who partake of it are joined in unity with one another. Even an ordinary meal nourishes the fellowship of those who take part in it, and this holy meal, this sharing together in Him who is the life of us all, works in us to produce a unity which is at the deepest level of our beings.

But when men thus unite themselves with Christ, He unites Himself with them. We eat and drink that which represents our Lord, not only 'that we may evermore dwell in Him', but also that 'He' may dwell 'in us', and thus, says St Cyril of Jerusalem, 'we become Christ-bearers'. To partake of the elements is a means by which Christ Himself enters into our spirits in such a way that our life and His-life-in-us become one.

All this takes many words to explain, but the important point is that to him who takes the bread and wine in faith, remembering Christ and the great deliverance He wrought on the Cross (as the Jews at the Passover remember God and the great deliverance He wrought in the Exodus), it hardly needs explaining. When performed in deed it is perfectly simple, and even if the worshipper's conscious mind does not work it out, his subconscious mind accepts it and the work of God is done.

THE NEW TESTAMENT ORIGINS OF HOLY COMMUNION

MANY ATTEMPTS have been made to trace the origins of the Christian Eucharist to the influence of the Mystery religions and of Hellenistic religious ideas in general. The Mystery Religions centred in the worship of gods and goddesses associated with oriental religions, Cybele, Osiris, Isis, Attis, Mithras, and other divinities, and gained a wide following in Greece and Rome in the centuries immediately preceding and subsequent to the spread of Christianity. Secret rites and initiation ceremonies in communities of men and women of different races, which promised deliverance from fate and death, made a wide appeal to those who no longer found satisfaction in the ancient religions of Greece and Rome; and it is not surprising that many scholars have looked for the origin of the Christian sacraments in the sacred rites and religious meals of these communities. These speculations have been shown to be false and misleading.¹ There are few references to sacred meals in the texts which describe the Mystery Religions, and, whatever may be true of later times, the late date of the evidence makes it improbable that they were operative in the formation of the Gospel tradition in the period A.D. 30-60. Moreover, the religious ideas embodied in the teaching of Jesus Himself and of St Paul can be far more credibly traced to the Old Testament, to sacrificial meals, and to the religious associations of the practices of eating and drinking among the Hebrew people, to the Servant ideas of Isaiah 53, the Covenant conception, and the expectation of the great Messianic Feast connected with the eschatological expectation of the coming of the kingdom of God. 'Blessed', said the man who sat at table with Jesus, 'is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God' (Luke 14₁₅).

Whether the basic idea of sacrifice in the Old Testament is that of a *gift* or that of *communion* with God is a disputed question. Probably we have to allow for both conceptions. In the case of Jesus we may infer that it was not so much the Temple sacrifices as the sublimated idea of sacrifice in the figure of the Suffering Servant of the Lord (Isa 53) which deeply influenced His thought.² As the Servant was to give his soul 'an offering for sin' (*asham*),³ so He had come to give Himself 'a ransom for many'.⁴ At the giving of the Covenant on Sinai sacrifice was offered, and Moses said, 'Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord has made with you concerning all these words', and of the people it was said, 'They beheld God, and did eat and drink'.⁵

Although the idea of the Covenant does not often appear in the sayings of Jesus, it is mentioned twice at the Last Supper—indirectly in Luke 22_{29f.}, 'And I appoint (covenant) unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed (covenanted) unto me, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom', and explicitly in Mark 14₂₄, 'This is my blood of the covenant'. The great Messianic Feast⁶ appears to be in mind in the passage from St Luke just quoted, and probably also it is implicit in the stories of Feeding in Mark 6₃₅₋₄₄ and 8₁₋₉, which were fellowship-meals anticipating the future inauguration of the Kingdom. From time immemorial the common meal has been invested with religious significance in the ancient east, and this is probably the

reason why eating and drinking with tax-gatherers and sinners (Mark 2₁₆) on the part of Jesus gave such grave offence to the scribes. All these ideas lie behind the action of Jesus when on the last night of His earthly life He broke bread and gave wine to His disciples in the Upper Room at Jerusalem. Passover ideas also must have filled His mind.

On the day before the Last Supper Jesus sent two of His disciples, identified by St Luke as Peter and John, into the city to make preparations for the Passover meal.⁷ By an arrangement apparently made in advance they were to look for the unusual sign of a man carrying a jar of water. Following him, they gave the message of Jesus to the householder, 'Where is my guest room, where I may eat the passover with my disciples?', and being shown 'a large upper room furnished and ready', they prepared the Passover meal.

According to St Mark's account the Last Supper was the Passover meal, and very many scholars accept this view. Others, however, influenced by John 18₂₈, which says that the priests did not enter the Roman praetorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the Passover, and by John 19₁₄, 'Now it was the Preparation of the passover', as well as by indications within St Mark's Gospel, maintain that the Supper was celebrated twenty-four hours earlier. This is probably the better view, but learned opinion is almost equally divided.⁸ In any case Passover ideas must have been in the minds of Jesus and His disciples. They must have remembered ancient Jewish tradition,⁹ according to which on the eve of the departure from Egypt the Israelites killed and roasted a lamb 'without blemish', and ate it with unleavened bread and bitter herbs. When their children asked the meaning of the custom, they were to say: 'It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, when he smote the Egyptians.'¹⁰ The Passover, then, was a feast of remembrance; it powerfully called to mind a great act of deliverance. These traditions will have been recalled during the course of the Last Supper, and the Fourth Gospel rightly interprets the significance of Jesus when the Baptist addresses Him with the words: 'Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world.'¹¹ It is against this background of Old Testament teaching that we can best understand the New Testament narratives of the institution of the Christian Eucharist.

I

The New Testament narratives of the institution of the Eucharist are three, and perhaps four, in number: Mark 14₂₂₋₅, 1 Corinthians 11₂₃₋₅, Luke 22_{14-19a}, and possibly the fragment Luke 22_{19b-20}. Of these, the narrative of Mark 14₂₂₋₅ was already old at the time when the Gospel of St Mark was written,¹² and it may be older and more original than St Paul's account in 1 Corinthians 11₂₃₋₅. Luke 22_{14-19a} is also old, and apart from 19a is independent of St Mark's account. Whether we should add Luke 22_{19b-20} depends on how we interpret the thorny textual problem presented by these verses, which are omitted by Codex D, the Old Latin manuscripts *a d ff² i l*, and by *b* and *e* and the Old Syriac version which place 19a before 17.

The antiquity of the Gospel narratives is shown by the Aramaic constructions they contain, and that of St Paul's account by the fact that he expressly says that he is delivering to the Corinthians that which he had 'received

of the Lord', a phrase by which we are to understand, not a story received by direct revelation, but one handed down in liturgical tradition, probably that of Antioch in Syria. According to Joachim Jeremias,¹³ St Mark's short narrative contains no less than twenty Semitisms and Palestinian idioms.¹⁴ He concludes that it is the nearest to the Aramaic account of the Lord's Supper. St Mark's wording, he says, is 'earlier than the development and enlargement of the Aramaic original of the Last Supper, which took place long before A D 49-50, the results of which are to be found in Paul'.¹⁵ He even attempts to define a pre-Markan form of the tradition, which omitted the phrase 'my blood of the covenant', a phrase which is impossible in Aramaic, where a noun with a pronominal suffix cannot govern a genitive, and must have been added in the first decade after the death of Jesus.¹⁶ In a footnote he explains that the possibility that the word 'covenant' (which appears also in 1 Corinthians 11₂₅) represents Jesus' own idea is not denied. 'On the contrary', he writes, 'it is highly probable that Jesus declared that the time for the New Covenant had come, particularly because the promise of Jeremiah 31_{31ff.} was highly popular in his days, as is seen from the writing of the community of the new covenant at Damascus.'¹⁷

The Marcan narrative is preceded by the account of the meal when Jesus was eating with the Twelve during which He foretold His impending betrayal.¹⁸ To the question, 'Is it I?', asked by one after another, He gave the enigmatic reply: 'It is one of the Twelve, one who is dipping bread in the same dish with me.' That He was thinking all the time of His impending death is clear from His words: 'For the Son of Man goes, as it is written of him, but alas for that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.' Then follows the account of the institution of the Eucharist, the text of which is as follows:

And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God (Mark 14₂₂₋₅).

St Matthew's version¹⁹ is an edited form of St Mark's narrative in which he adds the word 'eat' after 'take', the command, 'Drink you all of it', the phrase 'for the forgiveness of sins' after 'for many', and 'my Father's kingdom' instead of 'the kingdom of God'.

The blessing is an act of thanksgiving, and according to Jewish custom would take the form: 'Praised be Thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who dost bring forth bread from the earth.' 'Take' manifestly refers to the broken bread which they are to receive as bearing a new significance. The word 'is' does not describe a relationship of identity and would not be expressed in Aramaic. 'On the whole, the least unsatisfactory translation is Moffatt's "Take this, it means my body"', because it suggests a certain valuation which Jesus has given to the bread both by His words and by His prophetic action in breaking it.²⁰ Just as the Old Testament prophets²¹ gave expression to their message by the aid of dramatic action, and thereby sought to make it effective, so

Jesus meant the broken bread to be a means whereby His disciples might share in the power of His self-offering and the virtue of His approaching death. In like manner the wine is given a sacrificial significance in the words: 'This is my blood.' The saying expresses the idea that 'as of old dedicated blood was applied in blessing to the people of Israel,²² so now His life, surrendered to God and accepted by Him, is offered to, and made available for men'.²³ The phrase 'of the covenant', whether original or added, expresses this idea, and it is further conveyed by the words 'which is shed for many'. These words show that Jesus had reflected long on Isaiah 53₁₂, which reads: 'Because his soul was delivered up to death, and he was reckoned among the transgressors, and he bore the sins of many.' There can be no doubt that the words of institution strongly affirm the atoning significance of Christ's death, and for this reason the Eucharist stands at the centre of Christian worship. 'For many' does not mean 'many, but not all', but in accordance with Hebrew idiom 'many in relation to the one sacrifice'. Jeremias rightly says that it has an inclusive meaning, 'the sum total, consisting of many', and he explains that 'shed' has a future reference, since in Hebrew and Aramaic the present participle is used, not only for the actual present, but also for the immediate future. Thus, he translates the whole phrase by the words: 'which is going to be shed for the whole world.'²⁴

The third saying in the account, 'Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God', shows that eschatological hopes were in the mind of Jesus at the Last Supper. He was thinking of the final consummation of all things. This idea is found also in the narratives of St Paul and St Luke and belongs to the essential meaning of the Eucharist. 'The drinking of the cup is a present participation in that fellowship (of the consummated kingdom) so far as it can exist here and now.'²⁵

The one saying we miss in the narrative is 'This do in remembrance of me', which is found in 1 Corinthians 11_{24f.} and Luke 22_{19b.} The saying is regarded by many critics as a Christian formation which expresses in direct speech a conviction of which Christians were conscious; but it may well be a genuine saying which St Mark's liturgical narrative took for granted. P. Benoit²⁶ explains it as a rubric and says: '*On ne récite pas une rubrique, on l'exécute*', 'One does not quote a rubric; one carries it out.' Jeremias²⁷ suggests an interpretation which is worthy of note. He points out that of four examples of the phrase translated 'unto remembrance' in the Greek Old Testament,²⁸ three speak of God's remembrance, and that in Scripture when God 'remembers' somebody He acts. 'He does something, He sits in judgement and grants His grace, He fulfils His promise.' Jeremias therefore renders the saying, 'Do this that God may remember me', and relates it to the Parousia. The community beseeches God to remember His Messiah by bringing the consummation to pass.²⁹

II

The second narrative of institution is 1 Corinthians 11₂₃₋₅:

For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, how that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks,

he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

To this account St Paul immediately adds: 'For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.'

It is not surprising that some scholars have assigned priority to this account in view of the early date of the Epistle.³⁰ In any case, the account is very old, older than the Epistle itself, for it is a tradition which the Apostle had received and handed on to the Corinthians. But it is less marked by Semitisms than St Mark's narrative and the difference shows signs of interpretation. Thus, St Paul adds to the words 'This is my body' the explanatory phrase 'which is for you', to which later scribes added the participles 'broken' or 'given'. Further, the words 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood' appear to be a modification of an earlier reference to the wine designed to exclude the possible misunderstanding on the part of Gentile Christians of the term 'blood'. In St Paul's account the covenant is established 'in' or 'by' Christ's blood; in St Mark's narrative the wine signifies His blood 'shed for many'. St Paul does not include this allusion to Isaiah 53^{1,2}, although probably the Servant idea is implied in his reference to the night when Jesus was 'delivered up'. Essentially, however, the basic assumptions of the two narratives are the same. The sacrificial nature of Christ's atoning death is common to both, also the idea that to receive the bread and the wine is to share in its power. That this is St Paul's belief is clear from his words in 1 Corinthians 10¹⁶, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?' The acts of eating and drinking 'proclaim the Lord's death', and the eschatological aspect of the rite, although more fully expressed in the sayings of Jesus quoted by St Mark and St Luke, is clearly emphasized in St Paul's words 'until he come'.

The command to continue the celebration of the Supper is expressed twice.³¹ The command 'Do this' means 'Perform this act', not 'Sacrifice this'.³² This mistranslation is not only impossible linguistically, but it is unnecessary exegetically, since sacrificial ideas are already present in the use of the terms 'blood' and 'covenant'. The teaching of St Paul elsewhere shows that he viewed the Last Supper in this light. In 1 Corinthians 5, he writes, 'For our passover also has been sacrificed, even Christ', and in Romans 3²⁵ he speaks of the act of God in setting forth Christ to be a means of atonement, through faith, by His blood.³³ The 'covenant' is described as 'new' or 'fresh'. Jeremiah 31³¹ is certainly in the Apostle's mind, but he has no thought of excluding the ideas and associations of the covenant at Sinai described in Exodus 24¹⁻¹¹. He clearly conceives of the bread and wine as 'supernatural food', as the warnings of 1 Corinthians 10¹⁻¹³ testify, where he says that our fathers 'all ate of the same spiritual food, and all drank of the same spiritual drink'; but it is alien to his teaching to suppose that he thinks of the elements as changed in substance. They are 'spiritual' or 'supernatural' in view of the meaning which Christ gives to them. The kind of communion which the Apostle describes is closely related to his teaching concerning union with Christ, but it is union with Him in the power of His reconciling death.

III

The third narrative of institution, Luke 22₁₄₋₂₀, is composite and may include two or even three different versions of the incident. The text is as follows:

14. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him. 15. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: 16. for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. 17. And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: 18. for I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. 19a. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body (19b. which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. 20. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you).

It has been widely maintained that St Luke derived verses 14-18 from his special source, L. If this view is correct, these verses may be the account current in certain circles in Palestine, presumably at Caesarea. The source may have included 19a, 'And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body', but it is more probable that this passage, which agrees closely with Mark 14₂₂, was appended by the Evangelist in the process of compiling the Third Gospel. Verses 19b-20, to which reference has already been made, are enclosed in double brackets by Westcott and Hort,³⁴ and are regarded by them and by many other scholars as a later interpolation.³⁵ But in recent years there has been a growing tendency on the part of many scholars to accept the passage as genuine.³⁶ It is contended that, although 19b-20 has much in common with Mark 14₂₄ and 1 Corinthians 11₂₄, there are important differences, and that the style is not Lucan.³⁷ It is maintained that 19-20 belongs to a third variation of the liturgical form of the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist.³⁸ These matters are still the subject of learned debate. Naturally the discussion has turned upon the question of the authenticity of 19b-20. It is possible, however, that whether this passage belongs to the original text of Luke or not, it is derived from a primitive source and is thus a different account of the story.

One point of the greatest interest and importance is the difference of doctrinal emphasis in 14-18 as compared with 19-20. The former is exclusively eschatological; the latter, as in St Mark and St Paul, connects the Eucharist with the atoning death of Christ. It is quite unnecessary to set the one account against the other, since both ideas are attested by the narratives of St Mark and St Paul. The objection that there is no textual support for the separate existence of 14-18 is not serious,³⁹ if the Evangelist derived these verses from the L source and himself added either 19a or 19-20.

If 14-18 is the narrative of a Palestinian community, one must infer that this community centred its interest, perhaps exclusively, in the joyful anticipation of the consummation of the kingdom of God. There is no good reason why it should not have been so, for we cannot assume that every Christian community celebrated the Eucharist in precisely the same form from the beginning. The references to 'the breaking of bread' in Acts 2₄₂, 46, 20₇, 11 may suggest that also in the primitive Jerusalem community attention was

concentrated upon the joyful experience of the Risen Christ and the expectation of His speedy return. If this inference is justified, concentration upon the eschatological aspect of the Supper was a stage which passed into a larger unity, and if we are right in tracing the addition of 19a to the hand of St Luke, we can see this stage in process of transition. A parallel example of eucharistic teaching may perhaps be seen in 1 Corinthians 11, for there St Paul appears to be emphasizing the importance of the death of Christ to a degree which apparently the Corinthian Christians had not sufficiently recognized. It is not a case, however, of earlier and later developments in the tradition itself, for both ideas, the eschatological and the soteriological, are plainly present in the ancient Marcan and Pauline narratives, and both go back to Jesus Himself. Parallel to the eschatological hope, and not to the exclusion of it, primitive tradition preserved the belief that Jesus interpreted the Supper as a memorial of His death and as a sharing in the power of His Sacrifice. Throughout the centuries, and still today, the Church celebrates the Eucharist in its twofold aspect of a present experience of fellowship with the Living Christ and a joyful anticipation of the perfected kingdom. We 'proclaim the Lord's death until he comes'. In doing this, we do not observe a rite of Hellenistic origin, but fulfil the intention of Christ, who instituted the Eucharist to give to those who love Him a part in His redeeming love, the experience of His presence here and now, and the opportunity to plead that His Sacrifice be fulfilled in a renewed and transformed world. As Charles Wesley sang,

*This eucharistic feast
Our every want supplies;
And still we by His death are blessed,
And share His sacrifice.*

VINCENT TAYLOR

¹ See H. A. A. Kennedy, *St Paul and the Mystery Religions*, pp.256f., C. Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, pp.257-66, T. Wilson, *St Paul and Paganism*, p.183, N. P. Williams, *Essays Catholic and Critical*, p.389, A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, pp.270-84, M. Goguel, *The Life of Jesus*, p.187, C. Gore, *The Reconstruction of Belief*, pp.724f.

² Cf. Mark 8³¹, 9³¹, 10^{33f.}, 45, 14²⁴; Luke 22²⁷. ³ Isaiah 53¹⁰. ⁴ Mark 10⁴⁵. ⁵ Exodus 24¹¹. ⁶ Isaiah 25⁶. ⁷ Mark 14¹²⁻¹⁶; Luke 22⁷⁻¹³.

⁸ See J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp.14-60, A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, pp.13-23, Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, Appendix K, pp.664-7. ⁹ Exodus 12. ¹⁰ Exodus 12^{26f.}. ¹¹ John 1²⁶, 26. ¹² A D 65-7.

¹³ In *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. ¹⁴ Ibid. pp.118-27. ¹⁵ Ibid. p.132. ¹⁶ Ibid. p.135.

¹⁷ Ibid. p.135 note. ¹⁸ Mark 14¹⁷⁻²¹. ¹⁹ Matthew 26²⁸⁻⁹.

²⁰ Cf. Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, p.544.

²¹ Cf. Isaiah 20², Jeremiah 19¹⁰, 28¹⁰, Ezekiel 4³, 1 Kings 22¹¹. Cf. also Acts 21¹¹, and see R. Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, pp.299-305. ²² Exodus 24³.

²³ Vincent Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, p.138. ²⁴ *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p.151.

²⁵ Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel According to St Mark*, p.547.

²⁶ *Revue Biblique*, xlviii (1939), p.386 note 2. ²⁷ *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, pp.159-65.

²⁸ Leviticus 24⁷, Psalm 37 (38), title, 69 (70), title, Wisdom 16⁶.

²⁹ *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p.164. ³⁰ A D 51. ³¹ 1 Corinthians 11²⁴, 25.

³² Cf. Robertson and Plummer, *The First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians*, pp.245f.

³³ See my commentary on *Romans*, pp.32f.

³⁴ Cf. 'Notes on Select Readings', pp.63f. in *The New Testament in the Original Greek*.

³⁵ The arguments are (a) the probability that 19b-20 is a later addition intended to restore the order Bread-Cup in the Lucan narrative, and (b) the suspicious coincidence of its words with 1 Corinthians 11²⁴.

³⁶ Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p.106 note 1, gives a list to which may be added M. Goguel, F. Kenyon, S. C. E. Legg, A. J. B. Higgins, and C. S. C. Williams. It is argued (a) in order to obtain the order Bread-Cup it would have been more natural to omit the first

THE HISTORY OF HOLY COMMUNION

ON THE FACE of it, the history of Holy Communion is that of a development from the stern simplicity of the Last Supper through the complicated and elaborate ceremonial of the medieval High Mass to the dignified and orderly procedure, which can be elaborated or simplified at will, of the Office of Holy Communion in the Book of Common Prayer and the Methodist Book of Offices. This superficial impression is not wholly false, as we shall see. But instead of accepting it forthwith, and commenting, adversely or favourably according to our theological taste, on simplicity as opposed to complexity and dignity, it is better to ascertain first of all the various strands in the historical development, and then to adjudge for ourselves which elements in the developing liturgy really spring from the inherent nature and meaning of the Sacrament, and which do not.

The days are past when it was possible to think of Jesus at the Last Supper, when He distributed bread and wine, as simply acting 'out of the blue', that is, as doing something which had never in any sense been done before and for which the disciples were not in the least prepared. It is now clear that Jesus was doing something which was customary and investing it with a new and tremendous meaning. Some have thought that He was performing the *Qiddush* ceremony, which took place in Jewish households at the end of a meal on the afternoon immediately preceding the start of the Sabbath; in this, the head of the household pronounced a solemn thanksgiving over a cup of wine. Others believe the supper to have been a Passover meal. If it was, it followed an elaborate ritual which is well-known and needs no further description here, particularly since the characteristic Passover rites were not taken over into the worship of the infant Church when in the succeeding weeks and years its members followed their Lord's command to 'Do this'. This is not the place to discuss the various theories fully. Suffice it to say that a third one, that the Last Supper was a *chaburah* supper, seems to make the best sense of the Gospel narratives both as a whole and in detail, and of the subsequent development of Eucharistic rites. A *chaburah* in the first century AD was a society of people formed for devotional or charitable purposes, or both, and meeting for a weekly supper. This meal began, after 'appetizers' in the form of relishes of one kind or another, when the guests washed their hands and recited a 'benediction' while they did so. After this, the leader of the *chaburah* took bread and broke it, and gave a piece to each member of the group. Before each course was served the leader blessed it in the name of all present, except that

reference to the Cup in verse 17; (b) that the textual evidence for the passage, which includes all the Greek MSS. except D, all the versions except the Old Syriac, Marcion, Justin Martyr, and perhaps Tatian, is very strong, and (c) that the passage may have been omitted in order to preserve the account of the Eucharist as an *arcantum*, a secret to be hidden from profane eyes, 19a being preserved as a cue for instructed Christians much as the first line of a poem may stand for the whole. Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p.105. For 19a, cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, XLVII (1946), p.53.

³⁷ The Greek phrase in Luke 22²⁰ rendered 'even that which is poured out for you' refers to 'in my blood' and would be more correctly expressed in the dative case. Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p.102.

³⁸ Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p.103, A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament*, p.44.

³⁹ Cf. Jeremias, *op. cit.*, p.104, A. J. B. Higgins, *op. cit.*, p.40.

when wine was served, each guest said his own blessing. At the end of the meal the leader said a long prayer of thanksgiving over a cup of wine called 'the cup of blessing', each guest sipped from the cup, the group sang a psalm together, and the meeting was over.

It is fairly clear from 1 Corinthians 11 (other interpretations are possible, but this is the most likely) that in apostolic times the Church in each place, on each 'Lord's Day', met together to partake of the solemn meal of the Christian *chaburah*, now called the Church, and did so in much the same way as Jesus and His disciples had done on 'the dark betrayal night'. That is to say, it took a common meal, to which all the members had brought their contribution (the original significance of the word 'picnic'), in addition to receiving the bread and wine in the manner ordained by the Lord. The bread, be it noted, was broken and distributed *before* the meal proper, the wine was passed round *after* it. How long this practice continued it is impossible to say. When the evidence next becomes at all clear, the common meal has become separate from the fulfilment of the dominican ordinance. The blessing, fraction and distribution of the bread have been juxtaposed to the prayer of thanksgiving said over the 'cup of blessing' and the passing round of the cup, to form the main part of the 'Eucharistia' (the word being in origin a translation of *berakah*, the prayer of thanksgiving said over the cup); the meal, minus the blessing of the bread and wine at the beginning and the end, is now taken separately and called the 'agape' (originally the word for 'love' as Christians conceive it, and now perhaps the Christian word for the Christian *chaburah*).

The earliest undoubted description of the Eucharist is in the *Apology* of Justin Martyr (about 150 A D). 'There is brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water and wine. And he takes them and offers up praise and glory to the Father of all things, through the name of His Son and the Holy Ghost, and gives thanks at length that we are deemed worthy of these things at his hand. When he has completed the prayers and thanksgivings all the people present assent by saying "Amen". . . . And there is the distribution and partaking by all of the eucharistic elements; and to them that are not present they are sent by the hand of the deacons' (LXV-LXVII). But it may be that we have an earlier description in the *Didache*. It is necessary to say 'may be' because no one can be certain when the *Didache* was written, nor yet whether the rite described in it is an Agape or a Eucharist. But it is extremely likely that the *Didache* was written well before Justin's *Apology*, and that the description it gives is of the Eucharist, though it is bound to be noticed as curious that the wine is taken before the bread. 'Concerning the Eucharist,¹ give thanks in this way. First for the cup: "We give thanks to thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David thy servant, which Thou madest known to us through Thy servant Jesus. To Thee be the glory for ever." And for the broken bread: "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge, which Thou madest known to us through Thy servant Jesus. To Thee be the glory for ever. As this broken bread was scattered upon the hills, and was gathered together and made one, so let Thy Church be gathered together into Thy kingdom from the ends of the earth; for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever"' (IX).

Descriptions of the Agape are not numerous. But we probably have one

in Tertullian's *Apology* (A D 197): 'we do not sit down to supper before we have tasted something of prayer to God. We eat as much as hunger requires; we drink as much as befits temperance; we take our fill as men who are mindful that they must worship God even by night; we talk as men that know their Lord is listening. After water for rinsing the hands and lamps have been brought in, each is called forth to sing to God as his knowledge of the Scriptures or his own invention enables him, which is a test of how much he has drunk. Prayer equally marks the end of the banquet' (XXXIX). It would seem that the Agape varied from place to place in the manner of its celebration, and gradually ceased to be celebrated at all.

But in the second century the Eucharist was not only shorn of the meal with which it had originally been associated; it acquired an introductory section which came to be known as the 'Synaxis' or 'Liturgy of the Spirit'. This was in effect taken straight over from the synagogue service of the first century A D, and consisted of a Greeting said by the officiant and replied to by the Church, a series of lessons varied by psalmody, a sermon, the dismissal of those who were not baptized, and prayers of intercession. The only differences between the Jewish and Christian forms of service were, firstly, that in the latter the lessons included some from Christian writings, and secondly, that before the intercessory prayers the non-members of the community were sent away.

The full scope of these second-century developments is seen in the liturgy which is found in Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition*, which gives the practice of the Church in Rome at the end of that century (Eastern liturgies were not very different):

Opening Greeting and Response, followed by the Kiss of Peace.

Readings from the Old and New Testaments by the bishop (leading up, on Easter Eve, and perhaps other occasions, to the Passion story).

Exposition of the Scriptures by the bishop.

Dismissal of the non-baptized.

Prayers of intercession, divided by silences, for Church and State.

Offertory of bread and wine by the people.

Blessing of the bread and wine by the bishop and presbyters.

The dialogue of invitation (i.e. the 'Sursum Corda' in simple form).

The prayer of consecration (or 'Eucharistic Prayer'), said by the bishop (not in set words, but following a customary form, and leading up to the Words of Institution).

Communion of the bishop, presbyters, deacons and people, first in the bread, then in water and wine mixed.

Cleansing of the vessels used.

Brief formula of dismissal, said by a deacon.

This reads like a long programme; in fact, it may often have been finished in half an hour, if the bishop was brief and the congregation of moderate size. Yet we can see in it all the elements which are essential to the fulfilment of the Lord's command: 'Do this in remembrance of me.' There is the reading

and exposition of the Word of God, without which the Sacrament degenerates so easily into a meaningless rite; the offering by the people of what God has given them;² the prayer of thanksgiving and consecration, that the bread may truly become to the people the communion of the Body of Christ and the wine the communion of His Blood; and the actual communion, in remembrance (but so much more than remembrance as we understand the term) of Him. These elements remain to form the basic pattern of the eucharistic liturgy wherever we find it. Sometimes they are amplified and expounded, to which there can be little objection; sometimes they are overlaid by adornments and elaborations, to which there may be much objection; sometimes they are relegated to a subordinate place, to which there is every objection; but always they are discernibly present, except in those sad cases where the laity is not invited to communicate.

The first change which occurred in this ancient liturgy was in procedure, and consisted in the replacement of the bishop by a presbyter in most of the eucharists celebrated; this was, of course, inevitable with the growth of the Church. The next change was far greater; for the Edict of Milan in 313, bringing with it the 'peace of the Church' and leading to a close alliance between the Church and the Roman Empire, transformed the *ethos* of the Eucharist, just as it transformed the whole atmosphere of Christian life and thought.

While the Church was proscribed by the State and every Christian went in danger, remote or imminent, of his life, the worship of the Church was necessarily conducted in private, behind locked doors. In particular, the 'holy mysteries' of the Eucharist were shielded from the sight of those who might inform to the authorities or spread distorted versions of what took place (the elaborate precautions taken did not in fact prevent the spread of many a malicious canard about the Church, but this was their object). The dismissal of those who were not yet baptized before the Holy Communion proper began had this reason behind it, among others. But from the time of Constantine the services became public, and very soon not merely public, but positively fashionable. So the catechumens were no longer sent away without witnessing the climax of the ceremony, and the 'synaxis' was gradually so fused with the service as a whole that very little trace of the original separation remained. Nor was there felt to be any longer a need for simplicity. Churches were now great and splendid buildings in all parts of the Empire; the ritual conducted in them must clearly fit that splendour. With the splendid ritual went splendid vestments, which must not be in any way inferior to the garb of the secular counterparts of the bishops and clergy who wore them. And at the same time the service itself received many amplifications, of which only those which enhanced the meaning of the service need to be mentioned here.

Prayers for the various seasons of the Christian year were added to the first part of the service, perhaps because the Christians no longer wished to enter the timeless world of 'the heavenlies' as a respite from the harsh realities of a persecuting world, but rather were resolved to redeem the time series in which they lived their earthly life. Litanies and regular lectionaries were added also. The recitation of the Nicene Creed entered the service by a curious route. It was the custom of the Monophysites to recite the Creed agreed to at Constantinople in 381 (which we call the Nicene Creed) in order to proclaim their

orthodoxy against those who had adhered to the 'heretical' Definition of Chalcedon in 451, which had ruled out the line of thinking which led to Monophysitism. The orthodox, not to be outdone, came to proclaim their orthodoxy in the same way, and so the recitation of the Creed established itself as a regular part of the Eucharist, where, of course, it takes a proper place after the reading of the Word.

So far these changes were common to the Eastern and Western parts of the Church. But we are coming to the time when Eastern and Western Empires grew farther and farther apart, and one feature appeared in the East which was not copied in the West. This first occurs in the writings of St Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 370), and afterwards spreads rapidly. The consecrated elements are no longer the objects simply of thanksgiving and the devout desire to share in the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus; they have become objects of awe and even of terror. So it begins to be thought that only the clergy are fit to partake of them, and the laity ceases to communicate, except at home with a 'reserved' sacrament. The end of this process was reached when in the sixth century in Constantinople a solid screen was erected between the laity in the nave and the clergy in the chancel, and the people no longer even saw what was going on. Nor was there in the succeeding centuries any possibility of a protest against this misunderstanding of one of the chief purposes of Holy Communion. For shortly after this the imperial city, largely it would seem for political reasons, imposed upon all the Churches in the Eastern Empire the same customs and rites as were in force in Constantinople.

The history of the liturgy in the West was different. No inordinate awe of the Sacrament was encouraged; and the various Christian centres continued for a long time to use their own variations of the order of service. These were days, or rather centuries, of cultural and political chaos, which had the one good result that Spain and Gaul, as well as Rome, could pursue their own liturgical developments. In the end these converged into a synthesis, which is the Roman Mass as it remained until the Reformation, and still largely remains. The dominant partner in this was the Roman rite, built up on the pattern of the Gelasian (c. A D 500), Leonine (c. A D 550) and Gregorian (c. A D 600) Sacramentaries. At the end of the eighth century, Charlemagne, as part of his great policy to restore the unity of Europe under the twin rule of the Roman see and the Frankish monarchy, enacted that the whole of the Western Church should use the liturgy of Rome, slightly edited by his English adviser, that prince of liturgists, Alcuin.

It was in the Dark and Middle Ages, from about 900 to the Lateran Council of 1215, that the doctrine of transubstantiation was argued about and finally formulated. And it was during the same period that communion in one kind became the regular custom. The ill-educated and obstreperous barbarians who filled the Churches without quite knowing why they were there could not be trusted with the wine; and when they settled down to a degree of culture and unsophisticated piety, there seemed no reason to give them the wine when the whole virtue of the Sacrament was to be found in either kind by itself. It is not unfair to add that communication in one kind provided a useful distinction between the clergy and the laity.

More serious still was the gradual decline, almost to vanishing point, of the

communication of the laity in any form—not on grounds of awefulness, as in the East, but of lay ignorance. Nor can it be denied, in spite of all efforts by Roman theologians to argue it away, that the notion of the Eucharist as the repetition of the sacrifice of Christ was widely taught and believed in its crudest form. The result could have been foretold. The masses, passive, inarticulate, non-communicating, uncomprehending (for the Latin language was not much better understood by people at large than it is now), aware only that a mysterious sacrifice was being performed on their behalf of which they could only take advantage on certain specified conditions, fell back on their own private, individual devotions, and the Eucharist, the great feast of Christian fellowship, became simply an opportunity for innumerable personal prayers. Nor was it so among the masses only, as witness even St Thomas à Kempis when he writes 'Concerning the Sacrament'.

So the stage was set for the Reformation. Martin Luther was willing to retain as much of the Roman Mass as allowed for the communication of the people and the doctrine of justification by faith, and repudiated only what seemed to teach that the sacrifice of Christ could be repeated. Calvin's doctrine of the Real Presence was different from Luther's, but the liturgy which he favoured was simplified on much the same principles, with an especial emphasis on the necessity of conjoining the preaching of the Word with the celebration of the Sacrament. Cranmer's 'Calvinistic' (some would wrongly say 'Zwinglian') doctrine of the Eucharist and the influence of his Continental advisers, notably Martin Bucer of Strasburg, did not prevent him from gathering the best from every quarter, but they ensured that anything that smacked of a repeated sacrifice was repudiated and that the people were always invited to communicate. It is into his treasure house of liturgy that Methodists most gladly enter, and under his guidance we still hear the Word and its exposition, offer the sacrifice of what we have and are, give thanks for the Lord's Body broken, and His Blood shed, for us, and receive His Body and Blood by faith.

The time for liturgical development is not over. The Church of South India has remarried the divorced traditions of East and West. Once again in its liturgy the kiss of peace¹ is given, the bread and wine are brought in and offered to God, and the congregation takes a full and active part. We look to the young Churches of Asia and Africa to bring something to Christian worship which will be worthy of the past and the future, and offer yet greater honour to Christ, 'the one true, pure, immortal sacrifice'.

RUPERT E. DAVIES

¹ If the *Didache* is taken to describe the Agape, this word must be interpreted in the general sense of 'blessing'.

² The bread and wine offered by the people were finally commuted to money by Lutheranism and Cranmer, following some medieval precedents.

³ There is no vestige of this in the Prayer Book liturgy; most other liturgies retain it in an attenuated form.

THE HISTORY OF HOLY COMMUNION IN METHODISM

THAT THE Holy Communion is observed at all in Methodism is one of the triumphs of God's grace. It might easily have been otherwise. When the early Methodist people were refused the sacrament in their parish churches, when subsequently they developed their own means of grace, and when, above all, Wesley insisted on 'no administration without ordination', a short way of solving their problems would have been to allow the characteristic Methodist services—Love Feast, Covenant Service, Watchnight—to supplant the sacrament which has been so tragically a centre of controversy in Christendom. The Methodist people, however, wisely led, not only retained a firm hold on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but with deep regard and high doctrine implanted it indelibly in their discipline and organization. In the critical years following the death of John Wesley, it is significant that those who maintained that only an ordained person should administer, and those who believed that every preacher in full connexion ought to have that privilege, were at one in a high regard for the ordinance and in a strong desire for its regular observance.

The place of the Holy Communion in Methodism, like so much else in the Connexion, owes almost everything to the Wesleys. By practice and precept they instilled into their followers a regard for the Holy Communion which gave it a significance which it has maintained until this day. In fact, a renewed interest in the lives of the Wesley brothers has revealed that the Holy Communion was one of the most powerful forces in the revival which bears their name.

From their parents John and Charles Wesley inherited a high doctrine of the sacraments. In an age when the Holy Communion was celebrated only three times a year in parishes outside London, Samuel Wesley held monthly services at Epworth, and Susanna Wesley in her letters to John was capable of discussing with rare insight the nature of the presence of Christ in the sacrament. During Wesley's Oxford years the members of the Holy Club—*alias* Sacramentarians—attended Holy Communion at every opportunity, and he himself wrote a sermon which he republished virtually unaltered fifty years later on 'The Duty of Constant Communion'. The evangelical conversion of the Wesley brothers altered many of their views and practices, but it did not change their love for or their beliefs concerning the Holy Communion.

The first crisis the Methodist societies had to encounter had to do with the sacraments. The Moravians, to whom Wesley owed much, maintained that Christians should abstain from all means of grace until they had full assurance of faith. Wesley contended that faith was given in the sacrament, that it was a converting as well as a confirming ordinance. This was the immediate cause of the separation between the Methodists and the Moravians, for their positions were really irreconcilable, and the issue of the controversy determined the place of the Lord's Supper in Methodism. Part IV of John Wesley's *Journal* makes instructive reading on this point. By preaching, by personal example, by enforcement of 'Rules', Wesley kept his followers close to the recognized means of grace, and regular attendance at the Lord's Table became a prime obligation of all Methodists.

The difficulty in those early years was that the Methodist people depended upon the parish church for their sacraments, and not only were celebrations infrequent, but in many places the Methodists were not welcome at the parish altars. It was not long, therefore, before they began to ask for the sacrament to be administered in their own preaching-houses; but while the Wesleys were alive, this never became a general practice. Except at London and Bristol, where an ordained clergyman was always available and the Lord's Supper became a regular feature of Sunday morning worship, it is safe to say that during the lifetime of the Wesleys there was no general administration of the Lord's Supper in Methodist preaching-houses. During the last decade of John Wesley's life, there was an increasing tendency for him to administer in his chapels in the larger provincial towns such as Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds and Dublin, but there is no evidence to show that he administered to his societies apart from those rare occasions when it was possible for him to take them with him to the parish church. Generally speaking, we can discern five stages in the history of the administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Methodism.

1. At first, Methodists attended their parish churches, and also made the fullest use of the opportunities provided by communions with the sick (1738-43).

2. From 1743 onwards, the Wesleys and their ordained helpers administered in consecrated buildings which had been taken over by the Methodists, e.g. West Street and Wapping chapels in London.

3. At some point there arose the practice of administration in Methodist preaching-houses by ordained clergy. Apart from the early and isolated occasion when Charles Wesley administered to the miners at Kingswood on Sunday, 29th June 1740, it is difficult to determine exactly just when this stage began, but we do know that by 1774 the Sacrament was being administered at the Foundery in London.

4. The fourth stage was reached when Methodist preachers, ordained by Wesley in 1789, began to administer in Methodist chapels in England. (At first they were permitted to administer in Scotland only.)

5. The final stage came after Wesley's death, with general administration by Methodist preachers in Methodist chapels.

The conduct of the service in early Methodism was always according to the Anglican order, though later with Wesley's abridgement as a permitted alternative.¹ To this service, however, the Methodists added two significant features, hymn-singing and extemporary prayer; and Wesley's *Hymns for the Lord's Supper*, a collection of 166 hymns published in 1745, became widely used. It is important to notice that Methodism had its own way of conducting the service. When the early preaching-houses were equipped for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, the table was set against the pulpit and the minister conducted the service from the front or the side of the table. This should be contrasted with the Presbyterian arrangement where the minister was (and of course still is) placed behind the table. Furthermore, Methodist people came forward and knelt at the rail to receive the elements, whereas the Presbyterians received sitting in their pews. This created the Methodist tradition which prevails to this day, and is an indication of the fact that early Methodism stood, theologically as well as in practice, in the Arminian tradition of Andrewes,

Laud and the Caroline Divines, and not in that of the Calvinists of Geneva.

Now we must consider doctrine, which consciously or unconsciously determines practice; and for the early Methodist doctrine of the Lord's Supper we must turn to the collection of hymns just mentioned. Of course, to do justice to this very important subject, more than part of an article would be necessary, as Dr Rattenbury has shown in his book, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley*; but at least we can briefly summarize what were the chief points in the early Methodist doctrine of Holy Communion. They were the following:

1. The Lord's Supper is a real means of grace, not merely a commemoration. There is something *given* in the sacrament.

2. The real presence of Christ is to be discerned in the ordinance as a whole; it is not localized in the consecrated elements. Thus the sacrament is not just an act of memory, but a true *anamnesis*, an active recalling before God of the sacrifice of Christ, making it operative here and now. In the Lord's Supper, Christians 'share his sacrifice'.

3. The Lord's Supper implies a sacrifice—not a repetition of the all-sufficient, once-for-all sacrifice of Calvary, but an offering by the Church, the Body of Christ, of His body. Wesley's use of plural pronouns makes it clear that this offering is not made by an individual, be he minister or priest, on behalf of others, but by the whole Church as a community of worshipping believers; he is always careful to say 'we' offer. It is also the individual believer's sacrifice of himself.

4. The Lord's Supper is a foretaste of heavenly bliss; the eschatological element is always present.

It is against this theological background that we must set all that the early Methodists did and said about the Lord's Supper. Only so can we account for Wesley's own frequent communions, his sermon, 'The Duty of Constant Communion', the controversy with the Moravians over the Means of Grace, his ordinations and the important place which the sacrament has always occupied in the life of Methodism during the two hundred and twenty years of its existence.

Now we must leave the period of the Wesleys and consider the years following their deaths. On the death of John Wesley in 1791 a difficult situation faced the leaders of the Connexion. During the lifetime of their founder, the sacrament was administered only by the clergy or by those whom Wesley himself had ordained,² but after his death the feeling grew that the Methodist people ought to have the sacraments administered by their own preachers. At the same time, however, there were others in the Connexion who opposed this on the ground that it was contrary to Wesley's intentions; so Methodism was deeply divided. From 1791 to 1794 several attempts were made to reach a compromise, but no real solution was found. By the 'Plan of Pacification' (1795), however, the Conference was able to give consent for the sacrament to be administered by preachers in full connexion in any society where a majority of the trustees and leaders requested it. But even this did not prove to be a lasting solution, for there were many who would not be satisfied with anything less than general administration by the Methodist preachers. The strength of this demand can be judged by the fact that it occasioned the first

secession from the parent body, and the formation of the Methodist New Connexion. Eventually, of course, administration by the preachers had to come, for the door had been opened before Wesley died; but it came too late to prevent secession. In the mid-nineteenth century, some of the smaller Methodist bodies went so far as to allow laymen to administer.

A similar 'liberalizing' process can be discerned with regard to the time and place of the Lord's Supper in Methodism after Wesley. At first, it was laid down by the Conference that the sacrament must not be held during church hours; hence the growth of evening Communion services, which were practically unknown to Wesley. But before the end of the eighteenth century, when it was obvious that Methodism had its own life to live apart from the parish church, it began to fix its own time and place for its Communion services. In the end, it became customary for Communion to be administered once a month in the town churches and at least once a quarter elsewhere, usually after morning or evening worship.

The Wesleyan Methodists retained the Anglican order of service, though there seems to have been no one official version until 1882, when a *Book of Public Prayers and Services* was sanctioned by Conference. This book was intended to supersede all previous issues, and eventually did so. Although an edition of the *Sunday Service* appeared in 1910, this 1882 book remained in general use until Methodist Union in 1932.³

Officially, Wesleyan Methodism was committed to a 'fenced table'. In the early days, no one was allowed to partake of the sacrament unless he was a member of society, or had received a note of admission from the presiding minister. To the time of Methodist Union, the Wesleyan *Summary of Methodist Law and Discipline*, by Dr J. S. Simon, said: 'That the Table of the Lord should be open to all comers is surely a great discredit and a serious peril to any Church' (p.39). In actual practice, however, it was customary to invite to the Lord's Table all who loved the Lord. As T. H. Barratt once wrote: 'The Wesleys invited to the Lord's Table as many as they invited to the Lord and on the same conditions.'⁴

The other Methodist bodies were much more democratic in their attitude to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,⁵ though in practice, the Methodist New Connexion remained closest to the parent body. They had no official order of service, though several unofficial orders were in circulation for those who cared to use them. The United Methodist Free Churches and the Bible Christians had no printed orders at all; but both of them, and the Methodist New Connexion as well, were agreed in making provision for persons other than the minister to officiate. Furthermore, it was quite common for the elements to be delivered to the communicants in their pews by the stewards. To this day, there are many Methodist churches formerly belonging to the U.M.F.C., where there is no Communion rail, and where the minister must officiate, in a Presbyterian manner, from behind the table. The United Methodist Church of 1907 attempted to gather up the traditions of the three bodies who were parties to the Union—the Methodist New Connexion, the United Methodist Free Churches and the Bible Christians—and a book of Services was issued and monthly celebrations encouraged.

In Primitive Methodism the Lord's Supper was only gradually introduced,

and even then its observance was optional. By about 1860, however, it was consistently observed throughout the Connexion. Normally the minister presided, but laymen—preachers or otherwise—were sometimes appointed on the circuit plan to take sacrament services. An order of service was issued in the early part of this century, but its use never became widespread.

In 1932, there was a formidable task before reunited Methodism, no less than that of trying to reconcile the customs of the Wesleyans on the one hand with those of practically all the other bodies on the other hand. The differences came out most markedly on two points:

1. In Wesleyan Methodism a liturgy was invariably used; in the other bodies the service was of a free type, and even where a printed order was available, its use was occasional, if not exceptional.

2. In Wesleyan Methodism, no persons other than ordained ministers had authority to administer, except (in exceptional circumstances) probationers with a special dispensation from the President of the Conference. In the other bodies, laymen could administer, and even when the minister presided, the elements were often distributed by the stewards.

The most that could be done at Union was to say that 'the general usage of the Churches or denominations whereby the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is administered by ministers shall continue to be observed'.⁶ It was recognized that a transitional period would be inevitable, during which each circuit was to continue the practices of the denomination to which it belonged. Where a real need could be shown to exist, persons other than ministers could apply to Conference, through the Circuit Quarterly Meeting, for permission to administer. In 1947 the question of lay administration of the Sacrament was considered by a committee appointed by Conference, and as a result of their deliberations it was laid down that any person thus appointed should be instructed in the meaning and conduct of the service and that authorization should last for three years. Furthermore, 'all authorized persons (if not already set apart for the purpose) shall be inducted into their office at a public service under the direction of the Chairman of the District or a minister appointed by him'.⁷

In 1934 a new *Book of Offices* was authorized for use. It contained two Orders for the administration of the Lord's Supper, the first following closely upon Wesley's revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*, with the influence of the 1928 revision clearly upon its pages. The second order was designed for those who were not accustomed to liturgical service. This book has completely superseded all others and is now widely used throughout Methodism.

Doctrinally, much of the rich legacy of the Wesleys was lost after their deaths. *Hymns on the Lord's Supper* continued to be used until the second decade of the nineteenth century, but gradually the general hymn-book of 1780 with a supplement served all purposes, and most of the great doctrinal hymns on the Lord's Supper fell into oblivion. Apart from the teaching of Dr W. B. Pope, the main doctrinal emphasis was upon the Lord's Supper as an expression of fellowship and dedication; its sacrificial and eschatological aspects were almost entirely forgotten. Early in the present century Methodism caught the Nonconformist preference for individual glasses, and the use of the common cup is very rare today.

Since Union there has been a growing interest in liturgical studies within Methodism, and a determined attempt has been made to recover the great sacramental teaching and practice of the Wesleys. Early morning celebrations are not infrequent, and there are very few churches where celebrations are less frequent than once a month, usually after morning or evening service.⁸ It is probably safe to say that the number of communicants—in proportion to membership figures—was never higher than it is today (apart from the crowded services of the late eighteenth century). Lay administration is carefully regulated by the Conference, and the large majority of those who are authorized are probationers, lay-pastors and deaconesses. In Methodism, the criterion by which permission is granted or withheld has never been one of validity but of need, not of Orders but of order. The general feeling of the Methodist people (though not of their founder) has been that the person who is responsible for pastoral oversight of a society should have the privilege of administering the sacrament to his people, for often it was that person who first brought many of them to the Lord.

Throughout Christendom today, there is a renewed interest in liturgical studies, and a vast amount of liturgical experiment is taking place. To this, Methodism need not come empty-handed; let her bring a rediscovery of the sacramental doctrine and practice bequeathed by the Wesleys and she will have a worthy contribution to make.

JOHN C. BOWMER

¹ For details of Wesley's revision of the Communion Service, see the present writer's *The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism*, pp.207-11.

² For a careful investigation into Wesley's ordinations, see articles in the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society*, XXX.162, XXXI.18, 65 (Rev. Victor E. Vine), and comments in XXXI.22, 23, 47, XXXI.27 (Rev. A. Raymond George), and XXXI.102, 147. See also E. W. Thompson, *Wesley, Apostolic Man* (Epworth Press).

³ For a detailed study of the *Sunday Service of the Methodists*, see articles by the Rev. Wesley F. Swift in the *Proceedings of the W.H.S.*, XXIX.12, XXXI.112, 133.

⁴ Article 'The Lord's Supper in Early Methodism' in *Methodism: Its Present Responsibilities* (Epworth Press, 1929), and later published as a separate pamphlet.

⁵ See article by Norman W. Mumford, 'The Administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the Methodist Church after the death of John Wesley', *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, January 1951.

⁶ Deed of Union, *Minutes of Conference* (1932), p.303.

⁷ *Minutes of Conference* (1947), p.42.

⁸ Thus Methodism has maintained a close connexion between Word and Sacrament.

THE THEOLOGY OF HOLY COMMUNION

THE CHRISTIAN religion is inherently sacramental; it uses material means for spiritual ends. The increasing use and appreciation of sacramental worship in our time is therefore quite understandably accompanied by a more adequate theology of creation, human society, the Incarnation, the Church, and indeed of worship itself. Sacramental life means total life, the sanctification of all life through the presentation of everything to God.

The Christian religion is also inherently historical. Its focus is the Incarnation of the Son of God for us men and for our salvation, His life, death, resurrection and ascension. We preach Christ crucified. And if Christ hath not been raised, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain.

The sacrament of Holy Communion combines these two principles, the material and the historical as means for the attaining of spiritual ends. It suggests, symbolizes and conveys the heavenly through the earthly, the eternal through the temporal. It is set in time, yet it mediates the life of the ages. It brings together the past and the future in the present existential moment.

It is related to the past in that its very heart and soul is the death of Jesus Christ under Pontius Pilate for the sin of the world. According to the Lucan account, after taking bread, giving thanks, breaking it and giving it to His disciples, Jesus said: This do in remembrance of me. According to the Pauline account, the same admonition was repeated after the giving of the cup. Clearly, then, the sacrament is related to the past. It involves a recalling of what happened in the Upper Room and on Calvary. It is bound to events which happened in Palestine over nineteen hundred years ago, and must never be separated from them.

*In that sad memorable night,
When Jesus was for us betray'd,
He left His death-recording rite,
He took, and blessed, and brake the bread. . . .*

The fact that this ceremonial meal has from the beginning been held to be a link with the crucified Christ is impressive testimony against those who seek to abolish the 'scandal' of history either by denying that Jesus ever lived or by maintaining that all that is essential to Christianity can stand as general principles without any necessary connexion with history. From the first Pentecost Christians have 'done this in remembrance of' Christ.

The sacrament is also related to the future. 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come.' Christians believe that He who came 'to seek and to save that which was lost' will come again in glory to bring about the consummation of history, and they look forward with expectation and jubilation to His coming. Though they do not shirk their responsibilities in the towns and cities where they live, they are sustained by the knowledge that they are a colony of heaven. Every communion service is a foretaste of the Messianic banquet in heaven.

*By faith and hope already there,
Even now the marriage-feast we share.*

The past and the future are believed to meet in this 'even now'. The virtue of the past and the glory of the future unite to sustain the people of God as they travel their pilgrim way.

*'Tis here He nourishes His own
With living bread from heaven,
Or makes Himself to mourners known,
And shows their sins forgiven.*

Here and now the pilgrims eat the manna and drink the wine of heaven. Here and now they are cleansed and renewed and the image of Christ is stamped on their hearts.

Now while all this may be readily and even generally agreed, some will argue that these things are no less mediated through the preaching of the Word without the sacrament. The preaching of Christ crucified brings together past and future in the present. The worshippers see 'the wondrous cross on which the Prince of glory died'. They experience a foretaste of heaven in a service in which the Holy Communion is not celebrated if Christ is rightly lifted up there. What then is there distinctive about the sacrament?

There is, in the first place, the Saviour's institution of it. Jesus not only told His disciples to preach, but also to 'do this'. The sacrament must therefore have been intended, either to convey the same reality as the preaching, though in a supplementary way, or to convey something more. Two factors suggest the latter, though no attempt to say what the something more is, or might be, can be said to be satisfactory. The first is the place which the sacrament has held from the earliest times as the centre of the Church's devotion. The reason for this may be that the Church, by a sure instinct, recognized that in this sacrament her fundamental message is set forth. Furthermore, all ministers recognize that when they preach in connexion with a celebration of Holy Communion they are under a certain pressure to expound fundamental themes; any secondary issues seem out of place on such occasions. The second is that Churches which have a tradition of preaching and little sacramental life tend to become intellectualistic and barren, and Churches which have a rich sacramental life and give little place to preaching tend to become purely cultic, developing a religiosity which is remote from contemporary life and its problems. These considerations together suggest that preaching and sacramental devotion are inherently complementary, which further suggests that something is mediated through each which is not mediated through the other.

Another distinctive feature in the sacrament is the use of the specific symbols, bread and wine. The incarnate God extends the principle of the incarnation by giving Himself to His people by means of sensible symbols. The bread is composed of grain that has been ground, and the wine is obtained by crushing grapes. These are thus most appropriate symbols of Christ crucified, and are appropriately referred to by the Wesleys as 'mystic bread' and 'mystic wine'. They convey so much more than can be expressed in words.

But perhaps the most distinctive thing about the sacrament is that it is a drama, something done before men's eyes; it is an action in which they are invited to take part. It has affinities with the acted parables of the Old Testament (Jeremiah 27 and 28, for example) which were believed to effect that

which they symbolically expressed. The disciples were not told simply to remember what Jesus had done; they were told to take and eat. The most probable meaning of the command, beyond the thought of spiritual nurture, is that the disciples were in some sense to participate in the sacrifice of Jesus.

The dramatic significance of the sacrament is well brought out in the liturgy. No attempt has been made (except in small groups which are out of touch with the major tradition of the Church) simply to repeat what happened in the Upper Room. From the very beginning the sacrament drew to itself more and more of the Church's worshipping life, with the result that the richest and most complete service of worship consists of the preaching of the Word in the setting of the eucharistic celebration.

In some Churches today there is a revival of the ancient practice of the worshippers themselves bringing the bread and the wine for the celebration. The symbolism of this action is very close to that of the Harvest Festival, as some of the early Fathers said. The fruits of man's labour are offered to God in thanksgiving and are returned to them by God as the supreme means of grace. Further, the worshippers bring their sacrifices of money to God that those in need may be cared for and that the Gospel may be proclaimed. They also present their prayers and intercessions, and finally themselves as a living sacrifice to God. All these things are gathered up and presented to God in the Eucharist (the thanksgiving), and these actions are crowned by the act of adoration in which the Church on earth unites with angels and archangels to laud and magnify the name of God. All these sacrifices, these human actions, take place before the consecration of the elements. As the fruits of former Eucharists they are brought to God in preparation for the present Eucharist.

With the prayer of humble access interest moves from the actions of men to the action of God. Whatever the worshippers may have brought to the service, they 'do not presume to come to' the Lord's table 'trusting in their own righteousness'. They come that their sinful bodies may be made clean by His body and that their souls may be washed through His most precious blood, and that they may evermore dwell in Him and He in them. In this sacrament they seek for cleansing and abiding communion. These boons God alone can grant, and He grants them by giving to those who partake of the bread and wine in faith the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, or, as the prayer of consecration says, His most blessed Body and Blood.

These words seem to have been deliberately chosen to stress the humanity of Jesus, and that humanity as offered in sacrifice for the sin of the world. The key to the interpretation of them is to be found in the sixth chapter of St John's Gospel, where Jesus is reported as saying: Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, ye have not life in yourselves. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life. . . . He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him (vv. 53-6). These words appear to mean more than an appeal for faith, though they could have no meaning without faith. If the Saviour meant no more than that men would be saved by believing in Him and would be sustained by believing in Him, this is an extraordinarily cumbersome way of saying so. It would be a remarkable departure from the simple way in which He so frequently spoke about faith. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that in this passage, as in

the words of the institution, Jesus meant something more than when He simply appealed for faith, whether faith in God or faith in Himself. It is important to remember, however, that He went on to say: It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. In other words, the flesh and blood by which He nurtures the faithful are spiritual. When Jesus took our humanity He took it for ever, and in the sacrament of Holy Communion stress is laid upon the continuing humanity of the Son of God. He gives Himself to His people as the Lamb that was slain, with the marks of Calvary still upon Him.

(It should perhaps be stated that the above interpretation of the sixth chapter of St John's Gospel is more specific on certain points than are the comments of John Wesley in his *Notes on the New Testament*. On verse 51, his comment on the words 'If any man eat of this bread' is: 'That is, believe in Me.' On the expression 'My flesh', he comments: 'This whole discourse concerning His flesh and blood refers directly to His passion, and but remotely, if at all, to the Lord's Supper.' On verse 53 he comments: "'Eating his flesh"—is only another expression for believing.')

In their Eucharistic Hymns, however, the Wesleys expressly refer to the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament. They even use the term 'special presence'. This must not be interpreted as meaning, of course, that Christ is not present everywhere. It means, rather, that those who come to the sacrament in faith may be assured that when they receive the consecrated bread and wine they receive the fullness of Christ.

*The way Thou hast enjoined Thou wilt therein appear;
We come with confidence to find Thy special presence here.
He bids us eat and drink Imperishable food,
He gives His flesh to be our meat, And bids us drink His blood:
Whate'er th' Almighty can to pardon'd sinners give,
The fullness of our God made man We here with Christ receive.*

The question of objectivity is obviously of crucial importance. The sacrament is designed to be an assurance to the followers of Christ of His presence and of His saving grace, as well as to be a means of mediating them. It would be robbed of its power and efficacy if the worshipper became more occupied with the question whether he really believed, or whether his belief was right than with the assurance that the Saviour is really present. It must be maintained without any hesitation that He is really present, that He keeps His promise to give Himself to His followers in His appointed way. All experience teaches, however, that what we experience depends to a large extent on the experiencing subject. This is not to deny that there is something other than the experiencing subject which provides material for assimilation, but simply to affirm that the receiving mind is an important factor in determining what is received. The Eucharist is concerned with 'communion' and communion is a fellowship of persons. Hence two things may be affirmed: the first, that Christ is personally present and active; the second, that whether He is received or not depends on the attitude of the recipient.

Another centre of fierce controversy has been the question whether the sacrament should be regarded as a sacrifice. There is no question that from very early times it has been so regarded, and that it was so regarded by the Wesleys.

One of the sections in Hymns on the Lord's Supper is headed, 'The Holy Eucharist as it implies a Sacrifice', and many of the hymns are couched in the most vivid sacrificial language. This is readily understandable in view of the sacrificial language used by Jesus at the institution and repeated in every eucharistic celebration ever since. It is important, however, to define what is meant by sacrifice in this connexion. It is everywhere agreed that there can be no place for the thought of propitiating an angry God. Evelyn Underhill, in her invaluable book entitled *Worship*, defines a sacrifice as something given voluntarily and unconditionally to God. She adds that the element of cost must be involved, though the ruling thought is something given, not something given up. Christian sacrifice is an expression of homage and thanksgiving.

The Supreme Sacrifice is therefore the life and death of Jesus Christ. His obedience unto death, on behalf of all men, is the costing expression of man's proper devotion to God. It was voluntary, unconditional and at infinite cost, and it was offered once for all. It need never be repeated; it can never be repeated. It is the way that God has appointed for men and women to come to Himself. There is no question of a repetition of this sacrifice in the Eucharist. What is maintained is that in and through the consecrated elements the worshippers plead this once-for-all sacrifice before God. They re-present it. In this way the sacrifice on Calvary is kept in step with each generation. This is vividly expressed in the hymns of the Wesleys, as the following examples show:

*Thou standest in the holiest place,
As now for guilty sinners slain . . .*

*The Lamb as crucified afresh
Is here held out to men. . . .*

*He whom in ages past they slew
Doth still as slain appear. . . .*

*Thy offering still continues new,
Thy vesture keeps its bloody hue,
Thou stand'st the ever-slaughtered Lamb;*

and perhaps most vividly of all in the words:

*Still the wounds are opened wide,
The blood doth freely flow
As when first His sacred side
Received the deadly blow:
Still, O God, the blood is warm. . . .*

The Saviour is not offered up afresh, but the Church on earth comes to God through Him. Christ and Him crucified is the only plea of saints and sinners alike. At this point Protestant and Catholic are one. The 'real hope of common ground being discovered by our . . . being willing . . . to dig down deeper than we generally do toward the root', to which Professor C. F. D. Moule refers in his estimable book, *The Sacrifice of Christ*, is being re-echoed in many hearts.

Finally, it must ever be remembered that the Saviour gave Himself to God that His followers might do likewise, might present themselves a living sacrifice. Participation in the Lord's Supper involves participation in the Lord's obedience. In this sacrament, as the people of God look upon the Lamb that takes away the sin of the world, they hear afresh the call to walk in His ways and to do His will.

PERCY SCOTT

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SERVICE

THE SERVICE of Holy Communion or the Lord's Supper or the Eucharist has had fundamentally the same structure at least since the time of Justin, who lived about A D 150, and very likely from the time of the New Testament itself. But though the framework has been the same, the details have varied a good deal from place to place and from age to age; and the particular form which is now in use in Methodism has a long history in which various parts have been added at various times, much as an ancient Church often includes the work of various centuries all now blended into a graceful whole. The first order in *The Book of Offices* of the Methodist Church goes back in its essentials to the service adopted by the Church of England in 1552; that was but slightly altered in 1559 and in 1662. The service of 1662, which is still used in the Church of England, was further altered by John Wesley in 1784, and has been altered in Methodism a number of times since, the last such alteration being in 1936, but all these forms are substantially similar. The service of 1552, on the other hand, from which all this sprang, was a drastic revision, at the height of the Reformation, of what had existed before. Even so, it made use of a good deal of ancient material.

The service, ever since the time of Justin, has had two parts. The first centres in the reading and preaching of the Word of God. It was sometimes called simply the 'gathering' (*synaxis*) and sometimes the service of the catechumens, that is those who were being trained for baptism and membership of the Church. The second is the Sacrament proper, in which the Word is made visible, as St Augustine said. It centres in the rite which Christ instituted with bread and wine in the Upper Room. It was sometimes called the service of the faithful, that is of the baptized members, for only they were allowed to remain for it. This division still holds good. We can now examine the structure in detail.

THE SERVICE OF THE WORD

The form of this part of the service is derived from the lessons, psalms, sermon, and prayers of the Jewish synagogue; but a Christian content has been given to it.

1. *The Introduction*

(a) *The Lord's Prayer.* The model prayer stands at the beginning of the service. This prayer and the prayer that follows it stand here because in the Middle

Ages they were in England part of the private preparation of the celebrant, and this suggests that the Minister alone should say it aloud, as is often the practice. Those who do not wish to say the Lord's Prayer twice in one service should omit this one, and not the later one, which is more important to the structure.

(b) The Collect for Purity.

(c) The Commandments. We need to hear the Law before the Gospel. When we know what God requires of us, we turn more readily to Him for help. The practice of reading here the Ten Commandments from Exodus 20 began in Calvinism and was taken over by the Church of England in 1552. It is a more modern custom to replace them with the Commandments of the Lord Jesus, from Mark 12²⁹⁻³¹, to which in Methodism is added the 'new commandment' from John 13³⁴. It would be a pity, however, if the Ten Commandments fell altogether into disuse at this service, for they are still binding on Christian people. The first part of the response, 'Lord, have mercy', in Greek *Kyrie eleison*, is a very ancient part of the service, and is familiar through musical settings of the Mass.

(d) The Collect. The Collect concludes the Introduction, but it is also closely linked with the Epistle and Gospel that follow it. Though the rubric says merely that these 'may' be read, it utterly disrupts the structure to omit them. They vary with the season, and make a set of 'propers'; such a set is provided for each of the Sundays and other principal days of the Christian year. Their use helps us to keep the various aspects of the faith in their due proportion, without neglecting those which do not happen to appeal to us personally, and the fact that so many of them refer to particular events in the life of Christ helps us to live and die and rise with Him, and reminds us that we are redeemed by a series of mighty acts in history. They often constitute a link with other parts of Christendom which, at some seasons, will be using the same materials. The Collects are terse prayers; some are ancient; a few were composed at the Reformation.

2. The Word of God

(a) The Epistle. Originally this was preceded by a reading from the Old Testament, and the restoration of this is much to be desired, and would remove one of the objections to making this the main Sunday service. The Epistle precedes the Gospel, because most of the Epistles were written before the Gospels, and because the Gospel comes as a climax. Letters were probably read in the course of worship when they first arrived at a Church; they were found so helpful that some of them were preserved and read again on later occasions, long before anyone thought of them as being 'scripture' on a par with the Old Testament books which then formed their Bible; but the very fact that these letters were found so helpful in worship led eventually to their becoming a major part of the New Testament Canon, which came to stand side by side with the Old Testament. The Epistles are often concerned with problems of conduct or of theology rather than with the direct preaching of the Gospel; but the apostolic preaching is everywhere presupposed.

(b) The Gospel. The four Gospels no doubt came into the Canon in much the same way. It was found helpful in the service that someone should tell of

what God had wrought in the life, teaching, miracles, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ; some might do this from personal recollection of events which they had seen; others by oral tradition; but as those who had seen the events died, and an oral tradition was in danger of being corrupted, it was felt best that a written record should be made; and what thus proved helpful in worship became part of canonical scripture. Thus the use of the appointed Gospel ensures that in the Communion service we shall always be reminded of some particular incident in the life of Christ.

(c) The Creed. The Creed is at once a fresh proclamation of the Gospel and our believing response to it. The Creed commonly called Nicene is not actually the Creed of the Council of Nicaea, but it is nevertheless very ancient, and is the only Creed generally accepted throughout the whole Church, Eastern and Western, today. Creeds were first used as professions of faith at Baptism, then as tests of orthodoxy, and lastly (but for many centuries now) as hymns of praise during the service. Their authority is derived from that of scripture, for every phrase in the Creed can be justified from scripture. But we should not read the creed as if it were a legal document, but pour it forth as a great act of praise, which joyfully records the great facts and doctrines of the faith, just as they are recorded in the *Te Deum* and other great hymns.

(d) The Sermon. This is the traditional place for the sermon, and it is appropriate that the sermon should come soon after the readings from the Bible. (The rubrics do not say where it should come.) In some Churches it is preached after the intercession, in order to follow the ordinary pattern of a Methodist preaching-service, but it might be better if in that service also intercession came after the sermon, for the element of proclamation naturally precedes that of response. The sermon is an exposition of some part of that Good News or Word of God which the Bible contains, and this is shown by the fact that its form is the exposition of a particular text or short passage. This may well be the Epistle or the Gospel or some passage on a similar theme; yet the preacher is normally free to choose some other text if he thinks that right. The preacher is not there to give his own views, but to make clear the message already given to us all in the Bible; he is not of course infallible, but he is an ambassador speaking on behalf of God; and those who hear him with this in mind will find that in the sermon the living God confronts them with His demand and His offer. The sermon may fittingly make some reference to the Communion, but it should not usually be what is called a 'Communion Address'; it is the normal preaching of the Word. The Word needs also to be preached to those outside the Church; but it is not preached simply for the sake of any such people as have wandered in; it is the normal means of offering Christ afresh to His people. The sermon and the Communion itself are twin peaks in the service; there is no need to set one against another in invidious comparison; and to omit the sermon is a grievous breach of our Methodist tradition, which gives so high a place to preaching.

We are assuming that the Communion service, whether in the morning or in the evening, is the principal service, and that the ordinary preaching-service is thus incorporated in it. This is by far the best arrangement, for the Communion service includes in its structure all the elements which are normally found in the preaching-service. An early Communion service, followed by

preaching-services later in the day, severs Word from Sacrament in an unfortunate way; but when such a service is held the element of 'Word' is represented by the Epistle and Gospel; and it might be well to expound one of these, if only for two minutes.

Two other things may be mentioned here. First, if the Communion service 'follows', as we say, the preaching-service, there is no need to say the first part of the Communion service, for the preaching-service has in its own way covered the same ground as the first part of the Communion service; its lessons and sermon and prayers correspond to what we have already seen of the Communion service, and are in fact an ante-communion of slightly different kind. Therefore the minister should start the use of the printed service 'in the middle'. But, secondly, the preaching-service when there is no Communion should contain some elements, such as thanksgiving for redemption, which are hardly represented in the first part of the Communion service (unless in the hymns) because they are coming later in the service of the Upper Room itself. Therefore the preaching-service on the Communion Sunday may omit or lay less stress on these elements, for they are to come later; and the first part of the Communion service unaccompanied by the Sacrament itself would not suffice as a form of preaching-service, but would need supplementing if there were no Communion. But, thus supplemented, there is no reason why its shape should not be borne in mind on any Sunday, even when there is no Communion.

This concludes the service of the Word.

THE SERVICE OF THE UPPER ROOM

In the Upper Room our Lord took, blessed, brake, and gave the bread. He did the same with the wine, except that with the wine nothing corresponds to the breaking. This fourfold pattern is found, not only in the accounts of the Last Supper, but also in the biblical accounts of the miraculous feedings, no doubt with a deliberate allusion to the Lord's Supper. This fourfold pattern was closely followed in the early Church, and no doubt it would be prominent in any modern revision, as it is for instance in the service in South India; but when our service was composed in 1552, this was not seen very clearly, and this fourfold pattern is somewhat hard to discern. But in describing the existing service we must keep it in mind.

3. *The Offering*

(a) *The Offertory.* In the early Church the people brought bread and wine for the service, and also gifts in kind, which were afterwards given to the poor. Now we bring money; out of this are bought the bread and wine for the service, and the rest is given to the poor. This point in the service thus corresponds to Christ's action in taking; in many liturgies the celebrant actually takes the elements at this point, and places them on the table, but the general custom with us is that the table is already spread when the service begins. Many denominations claim to have rediscovered the meaning of the offertory in recent years, and they express this by having a procession in which members of the congregation bring the bread and wine to the celebrant; they often say that they identify themselves and their work with the bread and wine, and thus offer themselves. There are considerable theological difficulties about this.

During the offertory the minister reads scriptural sentences on the duty of almsgiving.

(b) *The Intercession, or Prayer for the Church Militant.* In the early Church the intercessions stood at the end of the service of the Word of God. In our service the offertory has rather unfortunately been thrust so far forward that a good deal now comes after it and thus forms part of the service of the Upper Room which might better have been included in the service of the Word of God. For this reason, if there is to be a pause for the departure of those who do not wish to stay to the Communion, it had better come after this prayer rather than at the beginning of the service of the Upper Room. But our present form of service has this merit, that it passes naturally from the offering of alms for others to the offering of prayer for others; and the prayer begins with a reference to the alms.

At the Lord's Supper we pray for the Church, following the example of our Lord Himself at the Last Supper (John 17). We also obey the scriptural command to pray for kings and rulers (1 Tim 2₁₋₂); it is assumed that they are Christians; often they are; we ought to pray for them, even when they are not; but the reference to the Church in the title of the prayer involves the idea of a Christian nation of which Church and State are simply different aspects. We also give thanks for departed Christians; the Church militant on earth must not forget the Church triumphant in heaven.

All members of the Methodist Church ought normally to stay to the Holy Communion, and visitors who are communicant members of other communions are welcome to do so; normally children and others who are not members will depart at this point, though there seems no reason why they should not sometimes stay without receiving the Communion.

When a preaching-service of the free type has formed the first part of the service, it is natural to begin the use of the fixed order at this point after the intercession, though it is necessary to insert the offertory for the poor before proceeding to the exhortation.

4. *The Preparation*

(a) *The Exhortation.* This contains a reference to 1 Cor 11₂₈. The Communion is for sinners. But we should come penitent. The exhortation concludes with an invitation.

(b) *The Confession.* The wording of this, as indeed of most of this part of the service, goes back to the Reformation.

(c) *The Prayer for Forgiveness.* Wesley significantly altered the 'you' to 'us', thus changing a sort of absolution into this prayer.

(d) *The Comfortable Words.* These convey to us the assurance of God's forgiveness.

5. *The Great Thanksgiving*

This corresponds to the second of our Lord's actions, namely, that He gave thanks (the word is *eucharisteo*, Luke 22₁₉) or blessed (Mark 14₂₂). Thus it has its origin in the blessing or grace which the Jews spoke before every meal, as Christians still do. But in this thanksgiving we praise God not simply for

food, but for the redemption which He has wrought in Christ. The thanksgiving thus spoken over the bread and wine makes it clear that they are here being used for a special purpose.

(a) *Sursum Corda*, Preface, and *Sanctus*. The dialogue which begins 'Lift up your hearts' is very ancient and reminds us that we are in the heavenly places. The preface reminds us that the service is one of joy and thanksgiving (eucharist); on certain days of the Christian year the insertion of a proper preface recalls a particular reason for thanksgiving. It would be well to revise the thanksgiving so that on every occasion not only Christ's death but the other mighty acts of God might be recalled. Then, in company with the Church 'Triumphant, we join in the song of the seraphim from Isaiah 6₃: 'Holy, holy, holy.'

(b) The Prayer of Humble Access. This was written at the Reformation, for a different point in the service, and it breaks the thought of the thanksgiving. Yet it is not unfitting that, as in Isaiah 6₅, the thought of God's holiness should be followed by expressions of our unworthiness.

(c) The Prayer of Consecration. The thanksgiving is resumed with a reference to the redemptive work of Christ and the institution of this means of grace; the Father is then asked that we may be partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ (cf. 1 Cor 10₁₆); this leads into the recital of the words of institution, which in most liturgies form part of this prayer, though sometimes they are read, not in the prayer, but 'as a warrant'. This wording of the prayer goes back, with but minor variations, to the Reformation. Its restrained and largely scriptural language is compatible with several views on the great theological questions which have been raised about the nature of Christ's presence, the 'moment of consecration', the relation of this service to Christ's sacrificial death, and so on; and, though no doubt some day it will be revised, we are fortunate in having a prayer which has survived many changes of theological fashion. By saying Amen, the people give their assent to what the minister has said as their representative.

Christ's third action was to break the bread. This was in origin utilitarian; the bread had to be broken to be distributed. It was not intended to symbolize any breaking of Christ's Body, of which no bone was broken (cf. John 19₃₆). But the use of one loaf was seen as a symbol of the unity of the Church (1 Cor 10₁₇); indeed, the service was often called 'the breaking of bread' (Acts 2₄₂). The symbolic breaking of a piece of bread, one of the so-called manual acts, was in early Methodism performed at the word 'brake' in the prayer. Now it is often omitted. The modern revival of interest in the 'four-action' shape suggests that it should not be done during the prayer, which corresponds to the second of Christ's actions, but should immediately follow it.

6. The Communion

This corresponds to our Lord's fourth action, namely that He gave the bread and the wine to the disciples. The minister first receives himself, as an example to the people. In Methodism we approach the table in small companies, a fact which, perhaps unconsciously, symbolizes our practice of having fellowship in small groups. The Communion is the climax of the service of the Upper Room. It is interesting to note that the names by which this means of grace is known

correspond to our Lord's actions, 'Eucharist' to blessing, 'breaking of bread' to breaking, and 'Communion' to giving. We lay the chief stress on the last, and that is why with us the most common name is 'Communion' or 'Lord's Supper', which lays the stress in the same place.

7. *The Conclusion*

(a) *The Lord's Prayer.* After silent prayer comes the prayer which Christ taught us, which has long stood at the climax of the service, either just before or just after the Communion.

(b) *The Prayer of Oblation or the Prayer of Thanksgiving.* The first prayer, the prayer of oblation, speaks of 'this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' and also our offering of ourselves to be a 'reasonable, holy and living sacrifice' (cf. Rom 12₁). It thus seeks to set forward a truly Protestant doctrine of sacrifice, and is based on a prayer used in 1549 before the Communion, which replaced some passages about sacrifice at the corresponding point in the Roman Mass. In 1552 the wording was further revised and the Protestant emphasis was doubly secured by its removal to a place after the Communion. Not till we have received afresh the tokens of God's love, do we think of offering ourselves to Him, for we are acceptable to Him only in Christ. 'We love, because he first loved us' (1 John 4₁₉); the initiative is always His.

The alternative prayer is called the Prayer of Thanksgiving.

(c) *Gloria in excelsis.* This ancient hymn has as its first section the song of the angels at the birth of Christ (Luke 2₁₄). It stood originally near the beginning of the service; now it forms a concluding act of praise, with which it mingles pleas for mercy, which even in the most exalted moments are never inappropriate.

(d) *The Blessings.* The first is from Hebrews 13₂₀₋₁, and was inserted at this point at the last Methodist revision; the second one, which is more traditional at this point, contains a reminiscence of Philippians 4₇.

No mention has been made here of hymns or of extempore prayer, but these, especially the communion hymns of Charles Wesley, may be used greatly to enrich the service.

The alternative Order of Service appears to be much shorter, but this is because it contains only the service of the Upper Room, and presupposes a preaching-service preceding it. It consists largely of the same materials, but they have been rearranged in various ways. It has achieved a certain popularity through its supposed brevity and for some other reasons, but those who have closely studied these matters nearly always prefer very strongly the first order.

In some of our churches a free order is followed which does not exactly conform to either of the printed forms. Those who wish to do this should first study carefully the structure of the first order lest in their attempt at spontaneity they omit important elements of the structure. For the first order with hymns and sermon contains within a short compass all the main elements of Christian worship and is a richly satisfying means of grace.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

COMMUNION HYMNS

GEORGE WITHER, maker of the first English hymn-book, wrote in 1623: 'We have a custom among us, that, during the time of administering the blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, there is some Psalme or hymne sung, the better to keepe the thoughts of the communicants from wandering after vaine objects.' A sufficient plea here, perhaps, to justify a hymn or two during a long celebration, whether or no we like organ interludes. But 'some Psalme or hymne' is a little vague. The Church is provided with many hymns written expressly, either to present some aspect of eucharistic doctrine, some insight into its rich meaning, or to give utterance to the penitent soul's hunger and adoration. Hymns of this character fulfil a function which may be compared with the devotional chorales interspersed in the great narrative Passion cantatas of Bach. The Eucharist in one aspect is a dramatic enactment of the Passion. There are moments during the celebration—or in preparation for it—which the worshipper may most fitly spend in private devotion. Many of the communion hymns in our hymn-books which are rarely sung can be of very great help to the individual communicant during the service, helping him personally to obtain all the benefits of his Lord's passion. The inclusion of hymns in the divine liturgy is, furthermore, itself a clear reminder that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the act of the whole Church, *sacramentum unitatis*. The hymn is *par excellence* a vehicle of corporate devotion, sung not by choir and clergy alone, but by the people of God. Hymns in the Eucharist reinforce, therefore, in their measure the doctrine of the priesthood of believers; they underline one of the most important truths in sacramental theology, namely, that the oblation is that of the whole Body of Christ.

In this brief study we may conveniently glance, first, at the Latin sequences and the eucharistic hymns of St Thomas Aquinas, secondly at the volume published by John and Charles Wesley in 1745, and lastly at some of the modern communion hymns as used in our denominational hymn-books today. But before any kind of metrical interpolations were thought of, we find embedded in the basic structure of the liturgy the earliest recited utterances of the Church, formed out of Holy Scripture itself. Hymns they may not be in the narrow sense, but we can hardly doubt that they were sung or chanted, as the disciples and our Lord sang after the Last Supper. How else, indeed, can such words find adequate expression? Choral communion in its later development is no mere aesthetic indulgence; it springs from the authentic desire to sing praises. These earliest canticles are the *Kyrie Eleison*, of which only a trace now remains in the response to the Commandments; the *Sanctus*, the hymn of the angels in Isaiah 6, in which the whole pre-Communion culminates; the *Agnus Dei*; and the *Gloria in excelsis*, which the Methodist office still tells us is to be 'sung or said by the Minister, the congregation joining with him'. To these should be added the *Benedictus qui venit*, omitted, surely without sufficient reason, by Cranmer in 1552.

Scriptural hymns apart, the metrical verses properly called eucharistic hymns fill a peculiar and distinctive place in the vast field of Latin and Greek hymnody. The introduction of rhythmical, later versified, sentences at various points of

the liturgy was a comparatively late development, and the story of their origin is something of a liturgical curiosity. For centuries, in the Western Church, hymns were confined to the daily Office Hours of Mattins, Lauds, and the rest. It was in the eighth and ninth centuries that the custom arose of embellishing certain parts of the Mass with melodic phrases, known as 'tropes', to which words were later attached. At two places in particular, namely at the Offertory and between the Epistle and Gospel (the 'Gradual'), they became established in the form known as Sequences. The names of Notker, to whom the hymn *Cantemus cuncti* ('The strain upraise') is attributed, and Adam of St Victor, are specially associated with this type of eucharistic hymn. After a period of great popularity most of the early tropes and sequences fell out of use; but the hymn had by then won a secure place as a valuable part of the Church's eucharistic offering. In some instances a hymn first intended for use at one of the Hours of the Breviary was later sung also during Mass. Such, for instance, was the famous *Pange, lingua, gloriosi Corporis mysterium*¹ of St Thomas, to whom we must now turn.

The five great communion hymns of St Thomas Aquinas are among the noblest productions of Latin Hymnody. They were written, at papal request, for the introduction of the Festival of Corpus Christi in 1263, though only one of them, *Lauda, Sion, Salvatorem*,² was actually intended to be sung at Mass. This hymn appears whole or in part in all the great missals of the Middle Ages. All have found many translators, and four of them will be found in current Anglican hymn-books. The most popular, in English translation, is Bishop Woodford's rendering of *Adoro te, devote, latens Deitas* ('Thee we adore, O hidden Saviour, thee'),³ the proper melody of which is put by Methodists to other uses.⁴ These are majestic hymns in thought and in language—the metres alone are a legacy to be grateful for. Also, they present much sound doctrine which neither Cranmer nor Wesley was concerned to deny.

The eucharistic hymns of Charles Wesley, approved by John and reissued several times during his lifetime, are probably—thanks in great measure to the work of Dr J. E. Rattenbury—more justly appreciated today than at any time since Wesley's death. Dealing as they must needs do with aspects of the Eucharist which are essentially controversial, with memorialism and the real presence, with sacrifice and priesthood, and using in some cases imagery crudely realistic, the hymns have sometimes been disparaged, sometimes misconstrued—and oftener still neglected. Read sympathetically, in the light of their back, ground and of Dr Brevint's prefaced meditations, they are at once a priceless aid to devotion, and a clear exposition of all aspects of reformed eucharistic doctrine; they also offer indispensable guidance to the student of the evangelical revival, and of the place of Methodism in the catholic tradition and the ecumenism of the present century. Written and published in the full tide of Charles Wesley's passionate mission, they stand as a lasting condemnation of any setting asunder of what God hath joined, namely sacramental devotion and evangelistic zeal. Fourteen of these hymns will be found in the *Methodist Hymn-book*; three or four have been used continuously in the Church of England. We have space here to glance at a few only of the most important. The fact that the examples cited do not occur in the section of the hymn-book devoted to communion hymns is significant: the offering of ourselves at the

Lord's Supper embraces and informs all the rest of our work and worship.

MHB 723. The second verse of this great hymn,

*With solemn faith we offer up,
And spread before Thy glorious eyes,
That only ground of all our hope,
That precious, bleeding sacrifice,
Which brings thy grace on sinners down,
And perfects all our souls in one,*

is scarcely paralleled in English hymnody, unless by William Bright's 'And now, O Father . . .'

MHB 181, 'Lamb of God, whose dying love we now recall to mind', is obviously suggested to the writer by the *Agnus Dei*. Wesley actually wrote 'We thus recall . . .'⁴—an even more direct allusion to a present act of commemoration than the general word 'now' which may refer to any occasion.

'Let Him to whom we now belong' . . . 'God of all-redeeming grace . . .', and 'Father, Son and Holy Ghost',⁵ which has been described as 'perhaps the greatest hymn of personal consecration in the language', all bring home to the 'weakest believer' the practical implications of the prayer of oblation which follows communion.

'Happy the souls to Jesus joined'⁶ and 'What are these arrayed in white'⁷ occur in that section of Wesley's volume which presents the Sacrament 'as a Pledge of Heaven'. This 'realized eschatology'—an important element in eucharistic doctrine—is inspired, perhaps, not so much by the *Sanctus* in which 'all the company of heaven' join, as by the prayer for the Church militant in its pre-Reformation form. As Dr Rattenbury has recently pointed out, the Wesleys were familiar with the Prayer Book of 1549, from which references to patriarchs, prophets and martyrs as well as to the Virgin were later excluded in the cause of reform. The Anglican (and Methodist) rite is the poorer for these omissions; but nothing is lacking from Wesley's hymns on the Church—'One Church, above, beneath'.

Lastly, in 'God of unexampled grace',⁸ written in rapt contemplation of the Cross, and in the most exalted moments of adoration, Wesley discerns and sets forth the Godhead of the Saviour, in a hymn comparable only with the later 'With glorious clouds encompassed round'. The verses are part of a long poem in that section of the 1745 volume whose theme is the Lord's Supper 'as a Memorial'. How far removed, however, is this hymn from 'pure memorialism'! To Wesley the Eucharist commemorates the past death of a Saviour both present and exalted—Good Friday in the light of Easter and Ascension-tide. Memorialism in any Zwinglian sense, indeed, is not to be found in the hymns of Charles Wesley.

To what extent are communion hymns, Latin, Wesleyan, or modern, used in celebration of the Eucharist today? Current denominational hymn-books all contain a section of hymns intended for this purpose. *Hymns A. and M.* (1950) has 43, *English Hymnal* 36, *Congregational Praise* 25, *Baptist Church Hymnal* 19, *MHB* 18. Probably many of them are rarely sung. If, as in the Free Churches normally happens, the celebration follows another service with sermon, no time is left for anything like a complete liturgy even if no hymns are used. In the

Church of England, the *English Hymnal* provides ample material for fully choral eucharists, with hymns indexed for use at the traditional places, and at the Parish Communion, which has in so many churches taken the place of a fully sung eucharist, hymns are frequently inserted. Uniformity of practice is neither to be expected nor desired. A comparison of the books now in use shows some half a dozen nineteenth-century hymns common to all or most of them—such hymns, for instance, as Heber's 'Bread of the world, in mercy broken', Conder's 'Bread of Heaven, on thee I feed', Bonar's 'Here, O my Lord, I see Thee face to face', and (one of the best) Rawson's 'By Christ redeemed, in Christ restored'. But it would be a mistake to define a communion hymn too narrowly by the section-headings of the compilers. Many 'general' hymns carry a strong sacramental reference. Doddridge's Advent hymn, 'Hark, the glad sound', in its Scottish form, received the official sanction of the Church of Scotland and was long ago included in its Communion Office. All hymns which take as their theme the soul's refreshment, the Bread and the Water of life, are obviously appropriate, as in John 6 the Feeding of the Multitude passes into a sacramental discourse. Such are all paraphrases of the 23rd Psalm: in Dr Strong's *Oxford Hymn-book* 'The King of love my Shepherd is' appears under the title 'The Holy Eucharist'. Such, again, is Monsell's perfect little poem, 'I hunger and I thirst'. F. S. Pierpoint's Offertory hymn, 'For the beauty of the earth', has lost in many hymn-books the verses that mark it as appropriate to that important part of the eucharist; they will be found in the *English Hymnal*. 'Praise to the Holiest' is a special case. It is included by Dr Strong as a sacramental hymn, and the Congregational compilers list it as a suitable alternative. What needless controversy has centred on Newman's 'essence all divine', which has been supposed to refer to the consecrated elements—a sort of obtrusion of transubstantiation! But the choir of angelicals are not concerned with earthly altars—nor, at the moment, is Newman, since his thought is concentrated in these verses on the God-Man, the Word made flesh, and upon His passion. Many other hymns on the Passion must needs contain phrases which recall some part of the divine office whose whole purpose is to 'show forth the Lord's death until He come'. What better communion hymn is there than 'When I survey . . .'? The Baptist hymn-book includes as eucharistic:

*For ever here my rest shall be,
Close to Thy bleeding side.*

This essay may well conclude with some appraisal of the value of communion hymns—whether medieval, eighteenth century, or modern—as means of instruction in the theology of the Eucharist. The influence of hymns in teaching sound doctrine has always been recognized. They can, of course, as easily be the means of propagating error. The angelic Doctor's *Lauda, Sion* gives us a precise and unequivocal statement of the doctrine of transubstantiation:

*Sub diversis speciebus,
Signis tantum, et non rebus,
Latent res eximiae;
Caro cibus, sanguis potus;
Manet tamen Christus totus,
Sub utraque specie.*

How much more satisfying, nay, how much nearer the heart of the mystery, is Wesley's approach:

*O the depth of love divine,
Th' unfathomable grace!
Who shall say how bread and wine
God into man conveys!*

*How the bread His flesh imparts,
How the wine transmits His blood,
Fills His faithful people's hearts
With all the life of God!*

*Sure and real is the grace,
The manner be unknown.*

But though it is impossible that all hymns should commend themselves to all shades of belief, we may be thankful that we have in them an expression of all that Holy Communion can mean to us. All its transcendent truths are here, and in the language of poetry which is often a surer guide than logic.

The Real Presence? Our Lord is both in Heaven, and here with and in His members:

*Lord, enthroned in heavenly splendour,⁹
... Thou art here, we ask not how.*

'Thou standest in the holiest place', and yet

*We need not now go up to heaven,
To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost e'en now Thy banquet crown.¹⁰*

The Sacrifice of Christ is presented in countless communion hymns. It can never be repeated; it is 'the one true, pure, immortal sacrifice'.¹¹ This doctrine is to be found alike in Catholic and in Protestant hymns. 'To think of this sacrifice and to celebrate it', writes Dr Rattenbury, 'is not a Roman error, but the central reality of the Protestant Reformation.' We have already quoted one of Charles Wesley's greatest hymns on this theme (*MHB* 723). Here is another in which he sets the self-oblation of Christ over against our representation of it:

*Yet may we celebrate below
And daily thus thine offering show
Expos'd before thy Father's eyes;
In this tremendous mystery
Present Thee bleeding on the Tree
Our everlasting sacrifice.¹²*

The Oblation of ourselves is inseparably associated in many Communion hymns with the sacrifice of Christ. Nothing is more essential than this in Protestant eucharistic doctrine. Wesley expressed this in a paraphrase of Psalm 116 in 1743:

*The sacred cup of saving grace
I will with thanks receive. . . .*

*And all I have, and all I am
Upon His altar lay.¹³*

And a few years earlier:

*Whate'er the Father views as Thine
He views with gracious eyes:
Father, this mean oblation join
To Thy great sacrifice.¹⁴*

In these and other hymns the implications of the eucharistic prayers are brought out; and the phrase 'Here we offer and present ourselves' is found to mean exactly what it says: 'Here', that is to say, upon this table which is also an altar. Thus all hymns of self-oblation are potentially eucharistic hymns; and only because Christ's work is a sacrifice can we call any service of ours 'sacrificial'.

One unifying note sounds through all the centuries of eucharistic hymns in all their diversity. It is that at Holy Communion all is to be done in penitence and faith; the Body and Blood of the Saviour are 'verily received *by the faithful*'. This is not post-Reformation only, but universal Christian doctrine, found alike in Wesley's line, 'In solemn faith we offer up', and in that operative first word of an invitation to communion of the seventh century: '*Sancti, venite, Christi corpus sumite*'.¹⁵ For, as the hymns so often remind us, the Holy Eucharist is *sacramentum unitatis*. In Christ shall *all* be made alive; and we all, being many, are one body in Christ.

*The sheep of Israel's fold
In England's pastures fed,
And fellowship with all we hold
Who hold it with our Head.¹⁶*

A. S. GREGORY

¹ *English Hymnal*, 326. ² *Ibid.* 317. ³ *Ibid.* 331. ⁴ *MHB*, 691.

⁵ *Ibid.* 574. ⁶ *Ibid.* 818. ⁷ *Ibid.* 838. ⁸ *Ibid.* 191.

⁹ G. H. Bourne, *Hymns A. and M.*, 400. ¹⁰ C. Wesley, *MHB*, 771.

¹¹ Wm. Bright, *Ibid.* 759. ¹² 'Hymns on the Lord's Supper', No. 124.

¹³ *MHB*, 399. ¹⁴ *Hymns and Sacred Poems* (1739).

¹⁵ *Hymns A. and M.*, 386; *EH*, 307. ¹⁶ 'Hymns on the Lord's Supper', No. 13.

THREE MEN IN A BOAT

A Study in the Relationship of the Scientist, the Theologian, and the Philosopher

(Concluded from p. 44).

II

NOW THAT we have looked at our three men one by one, I want to take them two by two to discover what they have to say to each other, and I shall take them in this order—

- (1) The scientist and the philosopher
- (2) The theologian and the scientist
- (3) The philosopher and the theologian

THE SCIENTIST AND THE PHILOSOPHER

In one of the chapters of *Science and the Modern World*, Whitehead traces the relationship between the scientist and the philosopher from the time of Descartes to our own day. Briefly he characterizes philosophy as turning in on itself. For Descartes, the first of the modern philosophers, the philosopher is the subject receiving experience. Science on the other hand turns to the objective external world. Consequently there has been a widening gulf between the two disciplines. Whitehead concludes his chapter by saying—

It should be the task of the philosophical schools of this century to bring together the two streams into an expression of the world-picture derived from science, and thereby end the divorce of science from the affirmations of our aesthetic and ethical experiences (p.183).

This has been the trend so far, particularly illustrated in the work of Whitehead himself and of Bertrand Russell. The danger is that the scientist may take over the work of the philosopher. The scientist may fall into the temptation of thinking that his is the only world, and thus draw a world picture which ignores aesthetic, ethical, and religious experiences. If, of course, we believe that theology and ethics have little of worth to teach us, then the task of the philosopher becomes merely an extension of that of the scientist.

This is in effect the position of the analytical philosophers. Wittgenstein wrote—

What can be said at all can be said clearly; and whereof one cannot speak, thereof must one remain silent;

Everything which can be known can be expressed in the propositions of science. Beside that there is the mystical, which is inexpressible.

Taken to its extreme, we have M. Schlick's dicta—'No meaningful problem can be insoluble in principle'; 'There is no unfathomable mystery in the world.' (All four passages quoted in Foster, *Mystery and Philosophy*, p.20.)

This movement is summed up by Michael Foster in this way—

The analytic philosopher conceives himself as an ally of the scientist in the task of dispelling mystery. Mystery will be conceived as arising from two sources:

- (i) lack of knowledge. It is the business of science to cure this;
- (ii) unclear thinking. It is the business of philosophy to cure this.

The goal towards which both scientist and philosopher are working is a state in which there will be no more mystery (*Mystery and Philosophy*, p.20).

This sounds to us like an unholy alliance, because we cling to mystery. Yet we have been reminded by Whitehead that the ages of rationalism have been the ages of advance in religious truth. It is in trying to dispel mystery that greater mysteries are revealed. The voice says: 'Get thee out of thy country, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee.' The wind bloweth where it listeth and science and philosophy can at times give a healthy breath of fresh air. If we make our religious and theological truths into museum pieces labelled 'Fragile. Please do not touch!' we must not blame the philosopher and the scientist if they ignore them.

Even if it is impossible, as we must believe it is, to eliminate 'mystery' from the universe, it is nevertheless right that the scientist and the philosopher should continue to make the attempt, but they would do well to bring into the conversation the theologian, who might remind them that the Tower of Babel myth may have some meaning.

THE THEOLOGIAN AND THE SCIENTIST

Because the Creed begins, 'I believe in God the Father, Maker of Heaven and earth . . .', the theologian is committed to an interest in science. Only the theologian can make such a statement as that contained in the first article of the Creed; but as soon as the question 'How?' is asked, he must turn to the scientist. It seems to me that we are wasting our time in trying to fit the modern scientific picture into the creation story of Genesis. We may admire any clever guesses, but the truths of Genesis 1-2 are theological rather than scientific. A description of the three-story world in which the writers of the story believed will help more than an attempt to trace evolution in the six stages of creation.

The scientist and the theologian are seeing things from a different viewpoint. If the physiological chemist or the psychologist tries to describe St Paul or John Wesley we shall get one picture; the theologian and the religious historian will give an entirely different picture. It will not be surprising if there are apparent contradictions.

So after an apparent divorce of religion and science on the grounds of incompatibility of temperaments, there seems to be a growing understanding. How fortunate we are in having within the fellowship of our Church a man like Professor Coulson, who in an address to the Handsworth College, speaking of science and religion, said—

For myself, thinking of the twenty-odd years since I began to puzzle over these things, I am driven to say that it is only as I am able to hold these two strands of human experience together that I can make sense of the world in which I live, or realize the full nature and destiny of its inhabitants. If the glory of God does not shine through science, if the work of science cannot be seen as God's work, then, as a scientist, I am involved in a duality of experience which will ultimately become quite intolerable, and

the more science I learn, the less whole and the more disintegrated will my life become (LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW, April 1953, p.88).

The scientist needs the religious vision to give his life integration. The theologian's vision of God can only be broadened and deepened by the scientific vision of God's universe. So the scientist, Einstein, writes—

Science without religion is lame; religion without science is blind.

And the theologian, Canon Raven adds—

Science can no more dispense with religion, than religion can dispense with science (*Science, Religion and the Future*, p.15).

THE PHILOSOPHER AND THE THEOLOGIAN

A reading of William James's *Will to Believe* brings out the distinction between philosophy and faith. The philosopher can never be a substitute for the theologian; he can go so far in building up a metaphysic, but there comes the jump of faith. But when you are going to make a jump of faith, you must not take off too soon and you must take off from firm ground. Religion, because of its subjective and emotional nature, might lose its power without the theologian. The theologian in turn is strengthened by the philosopher. To turn to Whitehead again—

Religion requires a metaphysical backing; for its authority is endangered by the intensity of the emotions which it generates. Such emotions are evidence of some vivid experience; but they are a very poor guarantee for its correct interpretation (*Religion in the Making*, p.71).

And again—

Reason is the safeguard of the objectivity of religion: it secures for it the general coherence denied to hysteria (*ibid.*, p.53).

The philosopher will often be accused of being an unbeliever, yet the man who asks pertinent questions may make a greater contribution than the man who reiterates generalities. We learn more from Job than from his comforters. The philosopher is concerned with the search for truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. He will not ignore the kind of truth that can only come through revelation, for 'the heart has its reasons, which reason doesn't understand'. Yet philosophy is more than a buttress to a religious faith. Theological students sometimes think that philosophy is going to provide them with clever answers to hecklers at open-air meetings. It is more likely to leave them with deeper questions than any the hecklers will ever ask, but it will leave them with no little vision of the world in which they are to preach their gospel. The theologian and the philosopher can only gain as they share their insights.

In conclusion, perhaps our little boat is not so different from the ecumenical boat. In the ecumenical boat churchmen of different traditions share their treasures, saying one to the other: 'This is what we have found of God.' So in our boat the scientist, theologian and philosopher need to share their insights.

In the ecumenical boat we have perhaps reached the stage when we have discovered that to say, 'That is an Anglican idea' or 'That is a Calvinistic conception', is not the same as saying, 'That is utterly false'. We need to come to the point where we realize that to say, 'That is a Greek idea', or 'That is a scientific viewpoint', is not the same as saying: 'It can't be true.'

There always will be mystery, and because of the nature of our Christian faith we shall turn to the theologian for dogmatic assurance. But just as the ecumenical boat gives us a greater vision of the Church than we have known before, so sharing with the scientist and the philosopher in our search for truth can only give us a greater vision of the Spirit who shall guide us into all the truth.

The important thing is to remember to ask the right question of the right person. In conclusion, I follow Jerome's three men in the boat and return by train. If you want to know how a train works, you don't ask the porter, you ask an engineer. The man at the inquiry desk will tell you what time it is due to start. The driver, we hope, knows where it is going to, but if we ask the profounder question, 'What time will it arrive?' the answer so often is: 'Heaven only knows!' Which is not as facetious as it sounds, for mystery remains, and the scientist, the theologian, the philosopher and the ordinary man—all of us—are at present only seeing through a glass darkly, but it remains our duty to see through it as clearly as we can.

BERNARD E. JONES

THE WISDOM OF MARK RUTHERFORD

ONCE READ, Mark Rutherford is never forgotten. I can still remember most vividly the experience of coming quite by chance on a second-hand copy of his *Autobiography* in an Oxford bookshop ten years ago. I looked at it, unprepossessing in its stiff black covers, awkward to get at on the winding staircase, and passed on. Yet something prompted me to return and reach for it. I began to read and was soon fascinated into entire forgetfulness of my surroundings. This was writing that could stab the spirit awake and deafen a man's ears to the rumble of traffic outside on the High. It seemed sacrilege that such wealth could be mine for 6d. I marvelled then, and still do, at the truth and delicacy of his art. No one can read Mark Rutherford and ever be quite the same again.

A highly selective writer, he expressed himself within a small, deliberately chosen compass. The conciseness of his art touches the imagination, does not strike it dumb with over-explanatory detail. Two slim volumes of semi-disguised spiritual autobiography, called *The Autobiography of Mark Rutherford* and *The Deliverance of Mark Rutherford*, followed by four short novels—*The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*, *Miriam's Schooling*, *Catharine Furze* and *Clara Hopgood*; a critical biography of John Bunyan, in which, by the way, his sympathetic yet keenly discriminating appreciation of Puritanism contrasts favourably with Matthew Arnold's imperfect understanding of it; a translation of Spinoza's *Ethic* and *Emendation of the Intellect*; selections from Johnson's

Rambler, with an admirable preface, and an equally excellent preface to Carlyle's *Life of Sterling*; various articles, essays and short stories, collected under the title of *Pages*, *More Pages*, and *Last Pages from a Journal*, virtually complete the list of his published writings.

William Hale White (for that was his real name) was born in Bedford on 22nd December 1831. His father kept a bookshop there, and was reputed to be a man of lively wit and pronounced character, an able speaker and forcible pamphleteer. There was one endowment, says the son, for which he was remarkable, the purity of the English he spoke and wrote. Partly he owed it to Cobbett, whose style he admired, but to a great extent it was a natural consequence of the clearness of his own mind and of his desire to make himself wholly understood. The truth was of serious importance to him, and he dared not obstruct it with phrase-making. In *The Early Life of Mark Rutherford* the son tells us that his father once said to him: 'My boy, if you write anything you consider particularly fine, strike it out.'

The childhood and boyhood of Mark Rutherford were, on the whole, fairly happy years. He wanted to become an artist. Like his brother, who died young and who had shown great promise as a painter, he loved drawing; but pressure was put on him, especially by his mother, to enter the Ministry as an Independent. The result was his entry as a student of Lady Huntingdon's College at Cheshunt, and later, in 1851, of New College, St John's Wood, but a difference of opinion with the authorities on the subject of the inspiration of the Bible led to his expulsion.

Rutherford escaped to North London, where the mean streets only added to his unhappiness at this crisis. He never forgot the awful moments when, looking through his little attic window, he saw London and the dull glare of its lights lying before him. 'There was no distinct noise perceptible, but a deadened roar came up to me.'

First he tried school-teaching at Stoke Newington, but that proved congenial. Then he called on several publishers and asked for employment, but without success. Both in the *Autobiography* and in *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane* he has described the humiliations a man must suffer when seeking for work in times when there is little demand for labour. 'Let no man judge communist or anarchist', he writes, 'till he has asked for leave to work, and a "Damn your eyes!" has rung in his ears.'

Eventually he found a job as a publisher's canvasser and clerk with John Chapman, Editor and proprietor of the *Westminster Review*. He became friendly with the sub-editor of the *Review*, a young woman called Mary Ann Evans. Rutherford appears to have been strongly attracted to her, and she for her part seems to have taken a kindly interest in this shy young man. George Eliot was then unknown to the world, but Mark Rutherford discerned in her a remarkable woman. 'I was grateful to her because she replied even with eagerness to a trifling remark I happened to make, and gave it some importance.' That, he was to discover, was always the way of George Eliot. If there was any sincerity in the person with whom she came into contact, she strove to elicit his best, and generally disclosed to him something in himself of which he was not aware. She delighted in music and 'played Beethoven one evening, as I shall never forget, to me alone'. The style of her conversation seemed to

him perfect, and the grounds of his admiration afford an interesting glimpse of his own ideals. 'It was . . . natural, but never slipshod, and the force and sharpness of her thought were never lost in well-worn phrases.' The same naturalness, force, and sharpness, a complete absence of anything slipshod, and a similar passionate concern for the truth, are everywhere apparent in the writings of Mark Rutherford. The portrait of Theresa in the *Autobiography* contains unmistakable resemblances to George Eliot.

Chapman offered him a partnership, which he declined. Instead, he obtained a post in the Registrar-General's Office, Somerset House. In 1856 he married Harriet Arthur. They had five children. Increasing responsibilities and his wife's precarious health added to his worries at this period. At length, however, in 1858, he obtained a well-paid post in the Admiralty. From then onwards he was gradually able to ease his labours somewhat and to provide a good education for his sons. The eldest (Sir William Hale White) became an eminent London physician. In consequence of his new job, Rutherford was able to give up journalism and devote his spare time to the writing of books.

There are various ways in which one may approach the works of Mark Rutherford. In what follows I shall merely select some aspects of this unjustly neglected writer which impressed me when I first read him.

I remember, for instance, being drawn to a writer who placed a consistent emphasis on the need for developing the faculty of admiration. Nowadays, in the field of literary criticism, depreciation appears to be an easy trick, within reach of the dullest faculty. We need to be taught to admire, to surrender ourselves to admiration, for, as Rutherford says: 'It is by admiration and not by criticism that we *live* [*italics mine*], and the main purpose of criticism should be to point out something to admire, which we should not have noticed.' He thought that in his own day there was too much belittlement of genius, especially by second- and third-rate critical intellects, themselves devoid of any creative spark. If he were alive today he would have even more cause for concern. Criticism, which began her life as the handmaid of literature, has become an arrogant hussy who finds it all too easy to acquire a reputation (of sorts) on some hard-up journal or wavelength. But perhaps ours is a second-rate age in literature. If so, then it is a beautiful example of the working of Parkinson's law: the less there is worth criticizing, the more critics we have.

But it is not only in literature that Rutherford's admonition still holds good. In another sphere the danger of criticism, of biblical criticism, for instance, is that it may tend to divert us from that which is positive and life-giving. Rutherford insisted, rightly, that in controversy we ought to distinguish between that which cannot be proved and that which can be proved to be false. The existence of a world of spirits may not be provable, but it certainly cannot be proved untrue. For that which is simply not provable there should be tenderness, because the person who believes it is not confronted with what, if he is honest, should compel him to deny. It is scarcely worthwhile to attack widespread beliefs which are not provable, for it is almost impossible to make those who cherish them abandon them by pointing out that this or that bit of evidence is untrustworthy. 'Our duty is to busy ourselves with the extension of the provable: with every enlargement of it some fallacy is undermined and falls.'

Nor was such an attitude unrealistic or escapist. Mark Rutherford himself knew the torments of doubt. But he stresses the need for principles and the resolution to abide by them. *Vita sine propositu languida et vaga est*. Continual doubt weakens, distracts and paralyses all purposeful action. 'The more principles we have, if only we have the gift to *manage* them, the more *real* and less shadowy we shall be.' It was a lesson he learned early in his own life. He greatly treasured a letter he received as a young man from Thomas Carlyle. He was a devoted admirer of Carlyle, and wrote to him to express his gratitude for the help he had received from his writings. In the course of his reply Carlyle said:

'This is really all the counsel I can give you about what you read in my books or those of others: practise what you learn there; instantly and in all ways begin turning the belief into a fact, and continue at that—till you get more and ever more beliefs, with which also do the like. It is idle work otherwise to write books or to read them.

To dismiss this as Victorian didacticism at its stodgiest is to convict oneself of the worst kind of superficiality. The vast amount of inert ideas inculcated by modern educational systems should give us pause to think again. Rutherford stresses the need for passionate beliefs. It is passion that gives them vitality, passion that can bridge the distressing gap in our lives between protestation and practice. The character of Frank Palmer in the novel *Clara Hopgood* is relevant here.

Frank is a decent enough young man, attractive in person, amiable, very willing—perhaps too willing—to make himself agreeable with everybody. Brought up in an atmosphere of culture and distinguished intellectual society, he accepted willingly, even enthusiastically, the household conclusions on religion and politics, but they were never properly *his*, for he accepted them merely as conclusions and without the premisses: and it was often a little annoying to hear him express some free opinion on religious questions in a way which showed that it was not a growth, but something picked up. This is the flaw in an otherwise likeable character. His sentiments were appropriated. They were not organic. They did not spring from himself. Hence a certain lack of urgency in all his undertakings. Frank loved music and had a good singing voice, but, we are told, he

failed in his songs to give them just what is of most value—just that which separates an artistic performance from the vast region of well-meaning, respectable, but uninteresting commonplace. There was a curious lack in him also of correspondence between his music and the rest of himself. As music is expression, it might be supposed that something which it serves to express would always lie behind it; but this was not the case with him, although he was so attractive and delightful in many ways. There could be no doubt that his love for Beethoven was genuine, but that which was in Frank Palmer was not that of which the sonatas and symphonies of the master are the voice. He went into raptures over the slow movement in the C minor Symphony, but no C minor slow movement was discernible in his character.

A man who is made up of what he hears or reads always lacks unity and directness. In the story of Job, Mark Rutherford detected a certain want of

connexion and pertinence in the character of Eliphaz. Confronted by any difficulty or by any event out of the blue, he answers not by an operation of his intellect on what is immediately before him, but by detached remarks which he has collected, and which are never fused into a homogeneous whole. In conversation he is the same, 'first propounding one irrelevant principle and then another—the one, however, not leading to the other, sometimes indeed contradicting it'. How seldom is an action done by the whole man. Omnipresence as a divine attribute comes to meaning in organic growth. 'A tree does not develop first at this point and then at the other. *All over* it proceeds to perfection. So should the growth of character be.'

The most memorable characters in the novels of Mark Rutherford all seek to live their beliefs, in small things as well as great. The dangers of idealism unrelated to the unspectacular realities of everyday life are illustrated in *Miriam's Schooling*. Miriam anticipates results; she sees herself as a Florence Nightingale and a heroine, when all she is allowed to do is to scrub the infirmary floors. 'The root of inconsistency is a desire to achieve speedy results', remarks the author. 'To keep this desire in subjection, to shut the eyes to results, and patiently remove the dust to the last atom of it lying in the dark angle, is a good part of self-culture.'

JAMES A. MICHIE

MATTHEW THE APOCALYPTIC EDITOR

IT IS NOT possible in this article to discuss the authorship of St Matthew's Gospel, nor is there space to deal with the Synoptic Problem. We will, therefore, begin with the assumption that the final author or editor, as we should more correctly describe him, uses at least two written sources. First, he incorporates most of St Mark's Gospel. Sometimes he omits redundant phrases; at others he adds several words to what St Mark had already written. Secondly, he has a great amount of non-Markan material in common with the third Gospel. It is believed that both authors have borrowed this material from a collection of Sayings of Jesus which has been named Q. In addition, there is a certain amount of material peculiar to St Matthew's Gospel, which for the sake of convenience is referred to as M.

When we examine the narratives common to Mark, Luke, and Matthew, we notice that in St Matthew's Gospel the verses are sometimes modified or added to in order to give them an apocalyptic meaning which is absent from the original version. Moreover, in the Q sayings used by Matthew and Luke, the same trait is found, and many of the narratives peculiar to Matthew's Gospel have apocalyptic significance. In many cases we find parallel ideas and teaching in apocalyptic literature. From these observations we assume that the final editor of St Matthew's Gospel belonged to the apocalyptic school of thought.

We will examine some of the material used by the editor from his two chief

sources, and also sayings which are peculiar to this Gospel, in support of this hypothesis. First, there is the Marcan narrative. The belief in angels is one of the chief tenets of the apocalyptic school. We notice that the author of St Matthew's Gospel has much more to tell us about this subject than either of the other Synoptic writers. Moreover, he is the only one who introduces a special feature of the doctrine, namely, the belief in guardian angels. For example, in Matthew 18₆₋₉, the writer follows Mark 9₄₂₋₈ closely; but at the end he adds these important words: 'See that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven' (v. 10). The dwelling-place of the angel of a little child, who is sinless and pure, would naturally be in the presence of God.

It is interesting to notice that we find no trace of guardian angels in the Old Testament; but when we examine a book which is closely associated with the apocalyptic writings, mention of guardian angels occurs. In the Book of Tobit, Raphael becomes the guardian of Tobias: 'Therefore, when he went to seek a man, he found Raphael that was an angel' (5₄). Probably, the following example was the first to occur in Jewish literature: 'The guardian of Jacob is great and honoured, and praised more than the guardian of Esau' (Jubilees 35₁₇), and the same idea appears in the Testament of Judah: 'Therefore my father was free from anxiety in the wars when I was with my brethren. For he saw a vision concerning me that an angel of might followed me everywhere, that I should not be overcome' (3₁₀). In these examples the guardian spirit is actually watching over the individual with whom it was connected.

Undoubtedly, the apocalyptic writers borrowed their idea of guardian angels from the Iranians. The Persians had a well-established belief in guardian angels (*fravashis*), and they taught that every individual has his spiritual counterpart: 'I desire to approach the Fravashis of the saints with my praise . . . and the Fravashis of the next of kin; and I desire to approach toward the Fravashi of mine own soul in my worship, and with my praise' (Ys. 23₄).

Another important teaching of the apocalyptic school is that of the final judgement. Although this subject is dealt with by each of the Synoptic Gospels, it is given far greater significance in St Matthew's Gospel than in the other two. (An exception to this, of course, is the eschatological discourse in St Mark's Gospel; but this is not regarded as belonging to the original Marcan material.) We have only space to examine one verse. After following Mark in his description of our Lord's Second Coming, Matthew adds the following sentence: 'And then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds' (16₂₇). It seems almost certain that this passage, which describes individual judgement, is based on a saying of Jesus. Although it does not occur in the other Gospels, we find traces of the same saying in at least two of St Paul's Epistles. A slight variation of it occurs in 1 Corinthians 3₈: 'But each shall receive his own reward according to his own labour.' Another variant is given in Ephesians: 'whatsoever good thing which one doeth, the same shall he receive again from the Lord' (6₈). It is characteristic of St Paul that when he uses a saying of Jesus he expresses it in his own words. Both St Paul and the editor of the Gospel make use of the saying in an eschatological sense.

The idea of rewards for the righteous is a very marked feature of apocalyptic teaching. The nearest approach to St Matthew's saying is found in Isaiah 62,

which was written in the early post-Exilic period of Jewish literature: 'Behold the Lord hath proclaimed unto the end of the world. Say ye to the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy salvation cometh; behold, his reward is with him, and his work before him' (v. 11). This verse is couched in apocalyptic terms which describe the final consummation and judgement, followed by rewards for the righteous. Probably, the saying is based on this passage.

The teaching of rewards for the righteous at the end of the world is also a special feature of Iranian eschatology. The following quotation bears a striking resemblance, not only to the underlying ideas, but also to the wording of the passage in St Matthew's Gospel: 'Afterwards, Saoshyant [the Saviour] and his assistants, by order of the Creator, Ahura Masda, *give every man the reward and recompense suitable to his deeds*' (Bund. 30₂₇).

Secondly, we will consider material from Q, which the editor of St Matthew's Gospel shares in common with St Luke. The Parable of the Talents in St Matthew's Gospel resembles the Parable of the Pounds in St Luke's Gospel. The main points of both stories are so similar as to warrant our assumption that they are variants of a single parable. As the story stands in both Gospels it emphasizes that the Parousia, though it be long delayed, is certain. The main theme seems to be that faithful stewardship will be rewarded, and that, on the other hand, unfaithfulness will be punished. This is shown in both accounts at a point where their wording is identical: 'But from him that hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away (from him)'. The two words in brackets are added by Luke.

It is at the end of the story that the important difference between the two writers is observed. St Luke finishes the parable with the words: 'Howbeit these mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me' (19₂₇); whereas Matthew again gives us a glimpse of his staunch support of the apocalyptic school by concluding his parable with these significant words: 'And cast ye out the unprofitable servant into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth' (25₃₀).

There are two features peculiar to Matthew's version of this parable. He stresses the teaching that some would be excluded from the kingdom because of unfitness. This idea is an essential trait in apocalyptic. Moreover, Matthew applies the term 'outer darkness' three times, and it is used nowhere else in the New Testament. As Luke gives us close parallels to the accounts in Matthew, where the term occurs, his omission of the expression is significant.

There is no conception in Hebrew thought of rewards or punishments after death. Indeed, the Hebrew idea of the hereafter was very vague. The existence of Sheol marks their acceptance of an existence beyond the grave, but it was regarded as a land of gloom. There was no distinction between the righteous and the wicked. God rewarded goodness and punished evil in this present life: 'Fret not thyself because of evil-doers neither be thou envious against the workers of iniquity; for they shall soon be cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb' (Ps. 37₁₁).

The teaching makes its appearance for the first time among the apocalyptic writers. These writers, like Matthew, taught that the wicked would be excluded from the Kingdom: 'I will give them over into the hands of mine Elect; as straw in fire . . . they will burn before the face of the holy [one] . . . for

they have denied the Lord of Spirits and His Anointed' (Enoch 48₉). Moreover, the idea that the wicked will be cast out into darkness is also found in the apocalyptic literature: 'Bind Azazel hand and foot, and cast him into the darkness' (Enoch 10₄).

These same ideas of punishment for the wicked, as well as rewards for the righteous, are also found in Iranian thought. For example, punishment for the wicked is described as follows: 'For him who deceives the saint, for him at last shall be destruction; long life in darkness his lot' (Ys. 31₂₁). Hence, we have Matthew only among the New Testament writers making use of a favourite conception among apocalyptic writers that the wicked shall be cast out into darkness, and the same idea goes back to Iranian thought.

There is a group of sayings in Matthew which finds its counterpart in St Luke's Gospel. Sometimes these sayings are identical, but there are several striking variations. We can only examine one here. Matthew's version of the saying, 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness', is a more spiritual rendering than Luke's: 'Blessed are ye that hunger now.' And Matthew says: 'Seek ye first His Kingdom, and His Righteousness' (6₃₃), whereas Luke simply states: 'Seek ye His Kingdom.'

'Righteousness' is a familiar word in apocalyptic literature. Matthew is the only one of the Synoptic Gospels where the word is used in a direct sense. Its only other use is as a quotation in Luke 1₇₅. In St Matthew's Gospel it is employed six times with apocalyptic significance: 3₁₅, 5_{6,10,20}; 6₃₃, and 21₃₂. The following quotation from the Book of Enoch is a typical example of the use of the word in apocalyptic works: 'And now I say unto you, my sons, love righteousness and walk therein; for the paths of righteousness are worthy of acceptance' (94₁). The word 'righteousness' is also frequently employed in Iranian literature. The expression 'O Thou Divine Righteousness' often occurs. It corresponds very closely to the phrase in the Book of Enoch: 'The Son of Man, who hath righteousness' (46₃), which is similar in meaning to Matthew 6₃₃: 'the Kingdom of God, and his Righteousness.' Hence, the use of the word 'righteousness' by Matthew indicates his interest in apocalyptic subjects.

Thirdly, when we consider the material which is only found in St Matthew's Gospel, we notice the same marked characteristic of the editor's interest in apocalyptic ideas. In dealing with this section, it is impossible for us to ascertain whether the author has made any additions or alterations of his sources.

Matthew 25₃₁₋₄₆ is a representation of the Day of Judgement, and each verse has apocalyptic significance. An interesting feature about the story is that the Son of Man is regarded as the Judge, and the expression used of His sitting 'on the throne of His glory' occurs in Matthew 19₂₈, but nowhere else in the New Testament.

One of the main points of this vivid description of our Lord's coming to judgement is that the soul of the righteous will be unaware of its own goodness. The soul asks in surprise: 'When saw we thee hungry?' Matthew gives us a beautiful ending to the questioning. Our Lord says to the righteous: 'Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. . . . The righteous [shall go] . . . into eternal life.'

The same idea of the Elect One coming in judgement at the end of the

world is found in the Book of Enoch: 'On that day Mine Elect One shall sit on the throne of glory and shall try their works, and their places of rest shall be innumerable.' Moreover, Enoch even enumerates the good works of the righteous which win for them eternal life: 'This place [heaven], O Enoch, is prepared for the righteous who . . . give bread to the hungry, and cover the naked with clothing, and raise up the fallen, and help injured orphans' (45₃₁). There is a resemblance between the two accounts.

When, however, we compare Matthew's story with a passage taken from the Testament of Joseph, we see that the Evangelist's description of good works performed by the righteous follows the same order as the verses in the Testament of Joseph:

Testament of Joseph 1_{8f}

I was beset with hunger and the Lord Himself nourished me.
I was alone and God comforted me.
I was sick and the Lord visited me.
I was in prison and my God showed favour unto me.

Matthew 25_{35f}

I was hungry and ye gave me meat.
I was a stranger and ye took me in.
I was sick and ye visited me.
I was in prison and ye came unto me.

This comparison strongly suggests that the source of this story was the Testament of Joseph.

These apocalyptic ideas seem to find their origin in the Iranian sacred books. In the Avesta the soul of the departed registers surprise at the approach of its conscience, which appears in the shape of a fair maid. The soul of the righteous asks who she is, and she replies: 'O thou youth of good thoughts, good works, and good deeds . . . I am thy own conscience.' It then declares to him his many deeds of kindness: 'When thou wouldest see a man making derision of holy things . . . or refusing to help the poor, and shutting his door; thou wouldest sit singing the Fathas . . . and assisting with alms the faithful who came from near and far' (Yst. 22₇₋₁₃).

From this brief survey we have seen how the editor of St Matthew's Gospel has, by his additions and modifications of his sources, emphasized apocalyptic teaching. In some cases his interest in this viewpoint has been so great that he appears to have given new and apocalyptic meaning to passages which, when studied in their original form in his sources, have an entirely different meaning.

P. HADFIELD

THE CHARACTER OF JOHN WYCLIF

SOME FORTY substantial volumes of his works in ecclesiastical Latin and a lesser number in English offer little indication of the kind of man John Wyclif was. References to personal experience are extremely rare. He permits his affection for Oxford to be known (*'domus Dei et porta celi'* he calls it) and there is a reference in *De Officio Regis* to his own unhappy experience of prelates who exact money from theologians for permission to study; but such disclosures are most infrequent, and one peruses in vain the pages of scholastic argument and theological invective in search of information about the man John Wyclif. After a lifetime devoted to the study of his works, Professor Shirley describes him as an author 'without personality or expression'.

The student who turns from the works of John Wyclif to his biographers meets a further difficulty. Wyclif is a controversial figure. Though the title 'The first of the Reformers' is perhaps a little too Protestant, for the *'sola fide'* of Luther is missing from his theology, Wyclif does denounce the whole medieval system with vigour and pungency. He stands at the parting of the ways. The consequence has been that biographers have tended to judge him from the preconceptions of their own theological positions. High and low churchmen both confess to this. 'No historian has yet been able to approach him with perfect sobriety of judgement' (Knowles).¹ 'His name has been the sport of excited partisans' (Workman).² Such treatment does not make very easy an unbiased assessment of the man's character.

The majority of biographers are prepared to concede his sincerity. McFarlane,³ one of the more critical, has this to say: 'It is possible to believe in Wycliffe's⁴ absolute sincerity as a reformer while at the same time suspecting that a plum or two even as late as the early 1370s might have shut his mouth for ever.' The reader does wonder whether McFarlane attains this possibility, particularly when he argues that the psychological explanation of Wyclif's rebellion was the 'bad grace' and the 'sense of persecution' which he harboured as a result of his failure to climb the ecclesiastical ladder. He reports, too, Hallam's tale that Wyclif's heresies had their origin in the disappointment of his hope of obtaining the Bishopric of Worcester (Hastings Rashdall⁵ calls the tale a 'malicious suggestion') and says it is 'at least credible'. Moreover, it is difficult to reconcile a recognition of Wyclif's sincerity with the statement that 'his head, never strong . . . was turned by his success as a disputant and preacher and by the flattering attentions of the great', or with the jibe: 'it needed the threat of persecution to turn the politician into a heretic: the truth alone had no such compulsive force'. However, in most biographies, even in those without the 'hagiographical intention' of which McFarlane complains, Wyclif is regarded as a man of burning sincerity. Knowles refers to his 'embittered spirit' and his mind 'perhaps pathologically obdurate', castigating him as 'the unspiritual polemist' and suggesting that arteriosclerosis was responsible for some of his faults. Yet he makes no suggestion of any duplicity of character; Wyclif may be mistaken, obstinate, opinionated, and proud, but he is not insincere. H. B. Workman is in no doubt about the matter. He sees Wyclif as a man of intense moral earnestness and argues that his personal character was beyond reproach: 'Wyclif himself was real: his bitterest foes could not label him otherwise';⁶ and

he quotes with evident relish the admission of Archbishop Arundel in examining the Lollard, William Thorpe: 'Wyclif your author was a great clerk and many men held him a perfect liver.' It could be argued that on occasions Workman is not critical enough. There was, for example, the question of the Prebend at Westbury. Wyclif was severe in his later denunciations of absenteeism among the clergy, and he disapproved of those who left their flocks 'by serving in secular business, taking one's ease in the schools or travelling abroad to visit the Roman pontiff'. Yet the facts are that when Wyclif was appointed Prebend of Aust at the church of Westbury-on-Trym, he was an absentee and he did not arrange for a vicar to serve in his place; further, he was one of the emissaries of Edward III at Bruges in 1374 to treat with the representatives of Gregory XI, and this was 'secular business'. Though it would be unjust to cast serious doubts on Wyclif's sincerity because of this one question, it cannot be denied that Workman takes a more lenient view of the matter than many others would. However, the main point is hardly in dispute. John Wyclif passionately believed in all he said and did, and no case can be made for sustained insincerity.

Another uncontested virtue of Wyclif was his interest in and his concern for the poor peasants of England. It is generally agreed that his social teaching was not a significant cause of the Peasants' Revolt in 1381, and certainly he had no hand in the course of events. At the same time, the peasants had his sympathy in their struggle. In *De Blasphemia*, Wyclif argued that though the peasants acted cruelly, the people really to blame were the clergy: '*Item notum videtur quod origo huius discordie sit debellacio exterorum; sed focus et concilium huius debellacionis sunt clerici et prelati.*' The punishment inflicted by the people on the clergy was excessive, but not altogether undeserved. Wyclif had a natural sympathy with the poor, and contended that they, not the religious orders, should be the recipients of Christian charity: 'But Crist haþ lymtyd in hys lawe who schulde have suche almes, pore men and blynde, pore men and lame, pore men and febel, þat neden suche helpe.' There is a warm humanity here which those who would dismiss Wyclif as a bad-tempered intellectual must take into consideration.

One of the novel features of the 'reformation that didn't come off' was the fact that some at least of the working people became aware of the more important issues of controversy. Wyclif broke with the custom of keeping matters within the university, which is what might be expected of one with his interest in the uneducated. It has long been assumed that the famous translation of the Bible was a continuation of this policy, and that Wyclif wanted the ordinary people of England to have that immediate access to religious truth and first-hand interest in religious affairs which possession of the Scriptures in the vernacular was bound to bring. Professor Deanesly⁸ has advanced a number of reasons against this, and has argued that Wyclif translated the Scriptures because of his conviction that they should stand as the authority which alone could replace the discredited authority of the medieval Church. A recent learned work by Sven Fristedt⁹ does not attempt to dispute this, though it gives Wyclif himself more responsibility for the authorship than Miss Deanesly allows. But the two motives for translation are surely not mutually exclusive. If the supreme authority for Christian truth could be available to the humble poor, no one would be more pleased than Master John Wyclif.

Another widely-recognized feature of John Wyclif's character is his ingenuousness and lack of worldly wisdom. This is shown clearly in his excursions into politics, where, for a time, he became a tool in the unscrupulous hands of John of Gaunt. When Wickham was put on trial in 1376 (at the instigation of John of Gaunt) for his conduct as a minister, Wyclif stumped the pulpits of London to denounce him. McFarlane calls him 'Lancaster's clerical hireling', and says, 'the most favourable interpretation possible for this episode is that he was in politics little better than a child'. The admiring Workman recognizes how deplorable was his submission to a man with whom he had so little in common. He compares Wyclif with the idealistic Oxford don who (in Workman's day!) represented his University in the House of Commons. It was not until the upheaval of the Peasants' Revolt in 1381 that Wyclif's political alliance with John of Gaunt was ended.

The same characteristic is to be found in connexion with the famous doctrine of 'lordship'. This doctrine was based on the assertion that those in mortal sin could not exercise 'lordship' over property. Though Wyclif saves the doctrine itself from being anarchical by a subtle distinction between dominion and power (the wicked may have power but not dominion over property, by God's permission), the attempt to relate the doctrine to fourteenth-century society was devoid of all worldly wisdom. Whenever a member of the clergy was in mortal sin, Wyclif would have had his property confiscated, not by his ecclesiastical superiors, but by the King and the nobles of the realm. This was a thoroughly unpractical solution, for it would have turned the Church into a State department and would have given almost unlimited power to a group of people wholly unfitted to possess it.

This impracticability can be seen in his optimistic theory that if the Church were to return to the simplicity and poverty of primitive times, all her problems would immediately be solved. Miss Deanesly asserts that this wild scheme, if put into practice, would destroy Christianity in the process. Whilst one can understand the desire of Wyclif to be rid of the corruptions and perversions of medievalism, this naïve attempt to put the clock back is not the solution of a realistic and practical reformer.

We pass to the other obvious feature of Wyclif's character—a tempestuous nature combined with a sustained capacity for invective. Few writers have poured out more vitriol than John Wyclif. The Pope, the cardinals, the monks, the canons, the friars, the Caesarean clergy, all received what Knowles called 'this sour legacy of hatred'. In *De Oratione* Wyclif gives his opinion of the Pope—'*sicut papa perversus est anticristus atque dyabolus, sic est mendacium in abstracto et pater mendacii*'—and on other occasions he refers to him as 'a limb of lucifer' and 'a simple idiot who might be a damned devil in hell'. As for the religious, they are 'the devil's nestlings' '*claustrum est nidus dyaboli a quo rapit multas animas ad infernum, in quo fovet pullos suos*'.¹⁰ One could quote page after page of blistering invective directed against the clergy and the customs of the medieval Church. As Thomas Arnold says in his *Introduction to the Select English Works*, 'anyone who looks even cursorily through these volumes will at once perceive that they exhibit everywhere a vehement and uncompromising spirit—a spirit which menaced what it attacked, not with reform, but with destruction'. F. D. Matthews is unwilling to call this fanaticism, but it

cannot be far short of it. Rudolph Buddensieg puts up a spirited defence of Wyclif's language in his Introduction to the *Polemical Works*—'but with all the sharpness of the contest, with all the moral earnestness of the patriot and the Christian, the language remains full of a noble pathos and never descends to the reckless and fanatical declamation which . . . we are led (by critics) to expect'. We may concede Buddensieg his further point that Wyclif never relies on mere abuse. He argues his case every time. His sharp thrust that 'if a friar blesses a cask in the cellar he turns it into accidents without substance' must be taken with his monumental philosophical arguments on the subject of transubstantiation. It is less easy to exonerate him from the charge of 'reckless and fanatical declamation' if by that we mean a failure to see any good at all in his opponents. One can perhaps find consolation in knowing that the birth-pangs of a Reformation were bound to be excruciating. Certainly McFarlane's contention that invective was not a sign of zeal for reform, but a stock-in-trade of the religious controversialist, does not do justice to the earnestness of Wyclif's protest.

From evidence of this kind no comprehensive account of the character of John Wyclif can be given. One can only accept certain characteristics as factual. As has been pointed out, the causes of this are the impersonal nature of his writings and the controversial position he occupied amongst even his earliest admirers and critics. It remains to be seen whether historians can improve upon this situation.

JOHN STACEY

¹ Dom David Knowles, *The Religious Orders in England*, Vol. II, *The End of the Middle Ages* (C.U.P.).

² H. B. Workman, *John Wyclif, a Study of the English Medieval Church* (O.U.P.).

³ K. B. McFarlane, *John Wycliffe and the Beginnings of English Nonconformity* (E.U.P.).

⁴ There are numerous spellings of the name.

⁵ Article in *D.N.B.*

⁶ H. B. Workman, *The Dawn of the Reformation*, Vol. I, *The Age of Wyclif* (Epworth Press).

⁷ *Select English Works*, Ed. Arnold, (O.U.P.), p.170.

⁸ Margaret Deanesly, *The Significance of the Lollard Bible* (Athlone Press).

⁹ Sven Fristedt, *The Wyclif Bible* (Stockholm Studies in English).

¹⁰ In *Responsiones ad xlv conclusiones monachales*.

BARTH AND BERDYAEV

THE APPEARANCE, volume by volume, of the translation of Barth's *Dogmatik* should make it once for all impossible for those who read him only in English to continue to judge him now by his *Romans*. The changes in his thinking since this was published have been far-reaching. As he himself tells us, he was influenced then by certain philosophical presuppositions he has since come to question; he has read more deeply in the Calvinist theology of the seventeenth century; above all, he has come to realize that the Church's life is not made up wholly of crises. She needs at times a trumpet-blast to arouse her, but also she needs constant provision for the maintenance of her activity of witness. But in *Die Menschlichkeit Gottes* he has spoken more frankly than ever before of the change the years have brought to him. He is even prepared to deal kindly with the liberal theology in which he was reared and to recognize that there may be that in it which is of permanent worth. But the

choice of 'the humanity of God' as his theme is interesting because it invites comparison with Berdyaev. Can we conduct an imaginary conversation between the neo-Calvinist and the Christian Gnostic?

To be sure, Barth's treatment of the theme would be an acute disappointment to Berdyaev. For it is clear that there is to be no departure from the Christological starting-point with which Barth has hitherto operated. The key to any understanding of 'the humanity of God' is to be found in Jesus Christ—not indeed in Him as the God-man, but in Him as the one in whom God so comes to us as to show once for all what He is like. He is not a God who dwells in solitary bliss, enjoying His own perfections. He is God with us and God for us, involving Himself in our human situation. He 'wills in His freedom not to be apart from man, but to be with him, and in the same freedom not to be against him, but to be for him, apart from what he deserves and even in spite of this—He wills in fact to be man's Partner and his almighty Saviour in mercy'.¹ In the light of this, everything human acquires a value, and the Christian is called to recognize the worth of every man and to stand forth as a champion of human rights. Secular culture, theology, and the Church—there is an abiding worth in all these. For God in the freedom of His love has willed to deal with man at all these points.

It is clear that Berdyaev would not be satisfied with this. He would regard it as having little in common with what he means by 'the humanity of God'. As he understands this, it is not derived from theology so much as applied critically to theology. He views man existentially; his humanity is not the equipment with which he enters the world but the vocation to which he is summoned. Man is the being who has it in his power to be human or inhuman—as he chooses. And recent history bears sad witness that all too often he chooses to be inhuman. Having done this, he then goes on to make God in his own image, to project upon Him his own base passions. In particular, he is guilty of 'sociomorphism'. That is to say, he supposes God to act according to the procedures of the kind of society he has brought into being. Thus, especially in Western theology, he has made God an absolute monarch, as arbitrary in His decisions and as self-centred as a Louis XIV, or he has set Him on the magistrate's bench and brought man before Him as a criminal to be tried for some offence against the law.

But man's vocation is to be human, and we all know what is meant by that. To be human is to forgive, to have compassion, to love, to go out toward others. And what theology most needs is that it should 'humanize' God in this sense. We must speak of Him in human terms, since we have no other language at our disposal. What is important is that we should use our highest categories, ascribe to Him only what is best in us. Judged by this standard, there is much in traditional theology that ought not to be retained; there is not a little even in the Gospels and what has come down to us as the teaching of Jesus that stands in need of revision. 'When we make judgements about God or when we pass judgement upon Him we can do this only from the point of view of the highest, of the divine, within ourselves. And the very revolt against God may be the action of God within us.'² It is particularly the theology of the West that has sinned in this respect, Berdyaev would say. Augustine and Calvin are the principal offenders. Russian religious philosophy, the

Greek Fathers, and the mystics are comparatively free of this 'sociomorphism'.

We can now see in greater detail how the controversy between the two men develops. For both, the relation between God and man is thought of after the pattern of dialogue and drama. God has created man to be His partner—both would say as much as that—has entered into covenant with him, and addresses His appeal to his freedom. Where then does the difference lie? Barth is quite clear that God initiates and sustains the dialogue, that the covenant is not between equals but between the Creator and the creature. The humanity of God is rooted in the Godhood of God and may only be rightly understood in the light of that. Berdyaev comes near to making the dialogue one between equals. Freedom is not a gift of God; it is a prior reality He had to accept when He undertook to create. There is even a sense in which man consented to be created. Man's creativity seems to share the throne with God's grace, and we arrive at the position of Eckhart, for whom man is as necessary to God as God is to man. 'In a certain sense my ego is a creative act. The world is my creative act. Another man is my creative act. God is my creative act.'³

From this arises the criticism directed against Barth, which is in part perverse and in part justified. For example, when it is said that 'in Barth's view the world was created as something outside the sphere of the divine and the creation possesses no independence',⁴ the point is quite missed. How could the world possess independence were it still included within the divine sphere? Is not the mystery of creation the fact that God brings into being an other-than-himself whose autonomy He thereafter respects, because it is His gift? Berdyaev still seems to think that *Romans*, with its insistence on 'the infinite qualitative distinction between time and eternity', faithfully represents Barth. He does not realize how far he has moved since those days. It is quite wrong to represent him as still working with the Old Testament concept of God. It is quite true that he goes too far in employing 'the categories of mastery, power, subjection, and obedience' in his account of the relation between God and man. But does he not insist that, while God is at once freedom and love, love takes precedence of freedom?

We have seen what Berdyaev's criticism of Barth is. It is not difficult to judge Berdyaev from Barth's standpoint. The latter would question whether the Russian's position is in fact a Christian one. For when Berdyaev has to choose between the Bible and the mystics, he chooses the mystics. Justification by faith, which is central for the one, has no appeal for the other. 'The very idea of justification brings falsities in its train and may lead to the degeneration of Christianity.'⁵ The fact is, of course, that the two men are separated by the wide gulf that divides Western from Eastern Christianity. Did not Berdyaev declare, shortly before his death, that after living for years in Germany and France, the mind of the West was still a sealed book to him? In the eyes of the East, the West is in bondage to Roman law; it has not dared to take seriously either freedom or love. On the other hand, the West may rightly ask the East whether it has not lost touch with the Hebrew strain in the Christian tradition, whether it has not allowed some elements of the Gnosticism it repudiated to establish themselves in its theology.

One point of agreement would seem to present itself, however. Even some of those who are otherwise attracted to Barth cannot follow him when he

promises universal salvation. Here, of course, Berdyaev is in cordial agreement with him. Hell is the most damnable instance of the projection of man's evil passions upon God. Origen was right when he trusted that even the devil would be reconciled to God at the last. The curious thing is that while universalism follows logically from Barth's basic principle, it is incompatible with that from which Berdyaev sets out. If God's predestinating decree is to be seen in Jesus Christ, in whom He destines all to salvation while He takes upon Himself the consequences of their sin, then we may well anticipate that none will finally be lost. But if man's freedom is independent of God, a datum with which He has to reckon in all that He does, then must we not admit at least as a possibility that some will to the end refuse to come over to Him? If mastery and subjection do not obtain in the relation between God and man, will He not have to accept such a decision as final and consent to the loss it entails for Him? I do not see how such a conclusion is to be avoided.

Another point of apparent agreement is the Christological appeal that both make. Barth's axiom is that 'theology is Christology', all must be derived from Jesus Christ. Hence the value that he recognizes in secular culture, etc., is seen in these only when they are viewed in the light of Christ. To continue the passage already cited: 'The highest humanity is the divine in man and the human in God, this is the mystery of God-manhood.'⁶ Here again we are faced by one of the fundamental differences between Western and Eastern Christianity. In the language of the text-books, the former—especially in the Calvinism on which Barth draws—is in danger of slipping over the line into Nestorianism; Eutychianism is the temptation of the East. While the West says that Christ did this as God and that as man, the East sees in Him what it speaks of as 'a theandric personality'. Hence the West works out a theology in which a distance is kept between God and man, a distance to be bridged by justification and reconciliation. The East, on the other hand, constructs one for which man is in his innermost being divine and salvation consists in the transmutation of his whole being into the divine as his true self.

It is difficult for one who has been brought up in the West to find a neutral standpoint from which to judge the two types of thinking and find a synthesis. Yet it does seem possible that Barth and Berdyaev represent two different approaches to the central mystery of the relation between God and man, and that in this they are faithful representatives of the traditions in which they stand. Man's relation to God is compounded of dependence and independence; he is dependent upon God for his independence; to preserve his independence a certain type of dependence is needed—not that of the slave upon his master, but that of the son upon his father. God wills that man should be free. May we not say that He would rather have man use his freedom in honest rebellion than surrender it to make peace by craven submission? Berdyaev, we can now see, would make man too independent of God; he does not possess his freedom as gift and trust from God; it comes from outside God. On the other hand, Barth does not allow man his full independence. God, we may say, creates the human so that it has a value of its own and does not need constantly to turn to Him to borrow this.

E. L. ALLEN

¹ op. cit. p.14.

⁴ Ibid. p.62.

² *Truth and Revelation*, p.116.

⁵ Ibid. p.118.

⁶ Ibid.

³ Ibid. p.76.

JEREMY TAYLOR ON GAMBLING

JEREMY TAYLOR, distinguished Anglican bishop and writer of the middle of the seventeenth century, had a varied career from the time of his Oxford Fellowship in 1635 and Chaplaincy to Charles I, to his death as Bishop of Down and Connor in Ireland in 1667 at the comparatively early age of fifty-four. His fame rests almost entirely on his devotional writings, particularly *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living and Dying* published successively in 1650 and 1651. These writings have a place in Methodist history, for they were among the devotional books which greatly influenced John Wesley in his Oxford days, and his preface to the published edition of the *Journal* would seem to suggest that we owe this immortal work, in some degree at any rate, to Jeremy Taylor. If in later life Wesley became somewhat critical, he never lost his gratitude for spiritual guidance and influence in those early years.

Jeremy Taylor himself did not regard these devotional writings as his chief contribution to literature or thought. The work he accounted of greatest value, indeed his *magnum opus*, was his compendium of moral theology published in 1660 under the elaborate title of *Ductor Dubitantium, or the Rule of Conscience in All Her General Measures; serving as a great instrument for the determination of Cases of Conscience*. It is a work of considerable erudition, though it did not command the attention he expected.

A first edition in my possession is a massive folio of more than 1,100 pages bound in full-calf. The paper is as firm and the printing as clear as when it came from the press, 300 years ago. My special interest is the study which is there made of gambling, at that time discussed as a problem of moral theology.

In order to appreciate what Jeremy Taylor has to say on this question it is desirable to have some idea of the form of gambling in that century. Unlike our present problem, gambling was not commonly practised among the ordinary folk. As Jeremy Taylor saw it, gambling was associated with the recreation of the more educated and privileged of the people. There were rogues and adventurers to be found in the gaming houses together with the more or less professional gamblers, but their associates and possible victims were the people who had both money and leisure.

The mischief of gambling was recognized by many and various writers, who pointed out the evil involved and the disastrous consequences. Charles Cotton published in 1674 *The Compleat Gamester*, in which he describes the games then current. His first sentence indicates the disastrous effects: 'Gaming is an enchanting witchery, gotten betwixt idleness and avarice; an itching disease. . . . It hath this ill property above all other vices that it renders a man incapable of prosecuting any serious action and makes him always unsatisfied with his own condition.' Samuel Pepys tells of the great extension of dicing and card playing which came in with the Restoration. The majority of the games played bear strange names which convey no meaning in this present century. One of the most popular was 'Hazard', and of this Charles Cotton says that when a man begins to play, he knows not when to leave off; and having once accustomed himself to play at Hazard he hardly ever after minds anything else. The serious social mischief of gambling was evident, and in

1664 an Act was passed entitled 'An Act against Deceitful, Disorderly and Excessive Gaming'.

The heading under which the question of gaming is considered by Bishop Jeremy Taylor in the Fourth Book is 'Rules of Conducting our Sports and Recreations'. Before considering those particular rules two preliminary subjects are discussed. In the first place, 'Some enquire whether the trade of Card-makers and Dice-makers be lawful'. The answer to this enquiry is based upon a clearly stated principle: 'Some things minister to sin immediately, others mediately only and by the intervention of something else; some minister to sin inevitably and by their design and institution, and others by the fault of them that use them ill; and lastly, some things minister to evil and to no good, others to good and evil promiscuously.' The conclusion is that if cards and dice can be used innocently, then the trade of making these instruments is also innocent.

The second preliminary question considered is 'Whether it be lawful to play at Cards or Dice'. Throughout the whole book considerable use is made of quotations from the patristic and classical writers. So in this section the opening words are a quotation from St Chrysostom to this effect: 'Not God but the Devil found out play.' The ancient belief that 'The chance and luck of it is a kind of geomancy or diabolical art' is contested. There cannot be an Act of God or of the Devil in the actual fall of the dice. 'There are so many evils in the use of these Sports, they are made trades of fraud and livelihood, they are accompanied so with drinking and swearing, they are so scandalous by blasphemies and quarrels, so infamous by the mis-spending of precious time, and the ruin of many families, they so often make wise men fools and slaves of passion, that we may say of them that use these inordinately, they are in an ocean of mischiefs, and can hardly swim to shore without perishing.'

The question is raised why the Christian Fathers and the Laws of the Church were so strong against these practices. St Cyprian says: 'A common Gamester or Dice-player may call himself a Christian, but indeed he is not.' St Clemens Alexandrinus says: 'Idleness and wantonness provided these games for the lazy and useless people of the world.' So ancient Councils of the Church declared: 'A Christian playing at Dice or Tables is not to be admitted to the Holy Communion, but after a year's penance and abstention, and his total amendment.'

This, however, does not really solve the point, which is: 'If Cards or Tables have in their own nature nothing that is evil; provided it can also be separated from all the evil appendages, from the crimes and from the reproach, from the danger and from the scandal, that which only remains is, that they as well as other innocent recreations and diversions may be used. In the case so stated we suppose them only to be recreations and relaxations of the mind.'

It would appear, therefore, so the argument goes, that cards and dice are of themselves lawful. It is the evil appendages which so frequently attend upon these games which lead to their condemnation, and it may be possible that these evil appendages can be separated from the games themselves.

Having reached this conclusion, Jeremy Taylor goes on to deal with his conception of the Rules of conducting Sports and Recreations. The first rule or principle is clearly stated in the first sentence: 'Let no man's affection be

immoderately addicted to them.' As in the case of eating, drinking and sleep, so sports and recreations should be used to the extent that 'they are necessary and useful to the purpose of our nature'. Plato is quoted: 'It is no great matter to play at Dice or Tables, but to be accustomed to it is a great matter.' So the application of the first rule is clearly indicated: 'When our Sports come to that excess that we long and seek for opportunities, when we tempt others, are weary of our business, and not weary of our Game, when we sit up til midnight, and spend half-days and often too; then we have spoiled the Sport, it is not a recreation but a sin.'

The second rule is equally clear and definite: 'He that means to make his Games Lawful must not play for money, but for refreshment.' The recreation to divert the mind or body from labours is destroyed and the game ceases to be recreative when other influences such as covetousness come into the game through the introduction of money. This point is made with considerable skill and clarity. 'If a man be willing or indifferent to lose his own money, and not at all desirous to get another's, to what purpose is it that he plays for it? If he be not indifferent, then he is covetous, or he is a fool; he covets that which is not his own, or unreasonably ventures that which is. If without money he cannot mind his Game, then the Game is no divertisement, no recreation, but the money is all the sport, and therefore covetousness is all the design.' The logic of this is unanswerable.

There follows an equally pointed comment on the inevitable fact, in such circumstances, that the gain of the winners is through the loss of the losers. 'Nothing is more base than to get advantages by the loss of others; they that do so, and make the loss of their neighbour their Game and Pastime, are the worst of men.' So also is it clearly indicated that the frequent statement about 'being willing to lose' is, after all, little more than a pretence: 'Concerning the loss of our money, let a man pretend what he please, that he plays for no more than he is willing to lose; it is certain he is not to be believed, for if that sum is so indifferent to him, why is he not easy to be tempted to give such a sum to the poor? To give that sum? Sport will not be the less if that is all he designs.' The point is emphasized that it is the association of money with the games that produces the mischief. 'It is alike in all Games, for I know no difference; money is the way to abuse them all.'

There is an interesting reference to the superstitious ideas that are associated with these games of chance, set out in terms characteristic of that century: 'In these cases, as I have heard from them that have skill in such things, there are such strange chances, such promoting of a hand by fancy and little arts of Geomancy, such constant winning on one side, such unreasonable losses on the other, and these strange contingencies produce such horrible effects, that it is not improbable that God hath permitted the conduct of such Games of Chance to the Devil, who will order them so, where he can do most mischief; but without the instrumentality of money he could do nothing at all.'

These then are the rules, and they are but two. The first, that the sport and recreation should be used with exceeding moderation only sufficient to serve the true interests of relaxation and recreation. The second, that such games should be played without there being any money at stake but for their own sake. The writer now discusses cases which are submitted with a view

to lessen the evil and bring the game from what is unlawful to lawful even though there may be money at stake.

In the first case the loser desires to continue to play in order that he may recover what he has lost, and it is suggested that in such a case the gaming is lawful. Jeremy Taylor has no patience with this argument, but says bluntly: 'The man had better sit down with that loss than venture a greater, and commit more sins.'

Another case is rather more subtle, and is put in this way: 'If I can without covetousness of the money play, is it then lawful? and to show that I am not covetous, I will give the money I win to the standers-by or to my servants, or to the poor.' This suggestion is described as 'A splendid nothing'. The question is asked, 'What kind of Sport is that to bring it into my power to oblige my play-fellow with his own money? and what bounty is that by which I reward my friends and servants with another man's estate?'

A somewhat different point is raised as to whether it is lawful for a man to possess what he gains by play. If it be admitted that the game itself is unlawful, can he retain what he has won by the play? The answer made to this can be anticipated by what has gone before: 'If it be unlawful, then when he hath won he hath got nothing, but is bound to make restitution, and cannot give alms of that; and then it can be good for nothing but on all sides pierces his hand that holds it like a handful of thorns.' St Bonaventure lays it down that 'Money that is gotten by play is possessed by no good title and cannot be lawfully retained; he that lost it, hath indeed for his folly deserved to lose it; but he that hath it, does not deserve to keep it, and therefore he must not, nor yet must he restore it to him that lost it, unless he persuaded or compelled him to play, but therefore the money is to be given to the poor.' This idea of giving the money to the poor is, however, subject to serious criticism: 'The money is gotten by an equivocal contract, and an indirect rapine, and therefore can never become a pleasing sacrifice to God; it is a giving our goods to the poor without charity, and that profits not.'

Coming toward the end of his argument, Jeremy Taylor poses the question whether a man under any circumstance can play lawfully at such games, and answers it by saying that only those can play who are dispassionate and of sober spirits under the command of reason and religion. It would appear that this high claim is virtually impossible to realize, for he adds that 'therefore to play for money will be quickly criminal'.

In a final section Jeremy Taylor is concerned with the advice that should be given to young men and boys. It is that they should 'At no hand be permitted to play at Dice or the Games'. This is based upon the argument that has preceded and that has left no doubt about the consequences that through the centuries have proved to be the outcome of play at dice and cards when money has been involved. He emphasizes the words of Cicero: 'What time other men spend in feasting and revellings, in dice and gaming, all that I spend in my studies; and that is very well, for though there is good charity in preserving our health yet there is greater necessity upon us that we do not lose our time.'

The final advice is concerned not only with the effect upon ourselves but the effect of our conduct upon others: 'We must neither do evil nor seem to do

evil; we must not converse with evil persons nor use our liberty to our brother's prejudice or grief.'

It must be admitted that the case is faced frankly. The arguments are supported by reference to experience, and not only the experience of the immediate present but of the past. The conclusions were certainly applicable to that seventeenth century in which Jeremy Taylor lived, but they are not without significance in relation to the same problem as we have it today. We may well ask whether there can be a better statement of the case than is given to us by Jeremy Taylor. It may be summed up in a few direct propositions:

That moderation should govern our indulgence in sport and recreation, directing it to the end desired of health and relaxation.

That money should not be associated with our games, for it introduces desires and passions alien to the games themselves.

That it is no justification to continue to indulge in order to recover losses which have been sustained, and wrong to inflict loss upon others.

That it is no justification, and certainly not according to charity, to give the winnings to others—not even to the poor.

That we have no ground for justifying the possession of money won by gaming.

That youth should avoid such games, leaving them to those who have reached old age, and even then they should be played without money.

E. BENSON PERKINS

Recent Literature

EDITED BY R. NEWTON FLEW

Doctrine de la Cure d'Ame, by Ed. Thurneysen. (Delachaux & Niestlé, Sw. Frs. 14.)

A University Christian group which searched this country in vain for someone to speak about 'Theology and Psychology' would have been happy to hear Professor Thurneysen of Bale. To some theologians, psychologists are a squad marching towards a precipice, and, like the famous drill-instructor, we beg the theologians, if they can utter nothing more commanding, at least to say goodbye to the squad. Professor Thurneysen, however, urges us to use every piece of diagnostic information available, but the cure of souls remains the declaration of pardon to an individual sinner, the shattering news that body and soul, in life and in death, he is no longer his own, but Christ's. There are three parts to this study: the theological foundations, the nature and form, and the practice, of the cure of souls. For one who does not share all the theological presuppositions of the author, the centre portion is most satisfying. In 1904, Professor Thurneysen visited Christoph Blumhardt at Bad Boll. Individual conversation with him was a releasing experience; an evening amongst his guests brought many subjects *sub specie verbi divini*. This convinced the author that the ministry of preaching must be confirmed in the private ministry of the cure of souls. He describes the 'double audition' of the one who ministers—listening to the person in need, but also listening to the prompting of the Word of God, all in the faith that the forgiveness of sins is relevant in this very situation. Then comes *la rupture*, when the pastor breathes the prayer of Ransom in 'Perelandra', 'In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, here goes', and the forgiving Word of God is uttered. This ministry of individual to individual is always within the Body of Christ. Rooted in Word and Sacraments, it leads back to them, and uses the Bible and prayer unashamedly. As the discipline of Christ, it avoids the errors of the Roman confessional and of convert-centred Pietism. Jesus Christ is the beginning and the end of all knowledge of man, but the doctrine of the Word of God cannot cope with psychotherapy. Professor Thurneysen does not advance beyond the paradox, 'Though he slay me, yet will I trust in Him'. Thus, Dr Leslie Weatherhead is dismissed in the same breath as Christian Science. Much personal ministry is conducted in the fear that it might have been surpassed by psychological practice, and yet many who have been to the psychologists still need the pardon of God which leads in all other blessings by the hand. Professor Thurneysen's stimulating book covers a vast field. Translated from German to French by Georges Casalis, it provokes hard thinking and aids harder ministry. C. HUGHES SMITH

Alcohol and the Christian Ethic, by T. G. Dunning. (Religious Education Press, 8s. 6d.)

It is unhappily true that for many years the great body of lay and medical opinion has regarded alcoholism as a hopeless disease, determined by moral failure. In consequence, the alcoholic has been exhorted to mend his ways, or punished for his misdoing, or ostracized by his neighbours. Within recent years, however, there has come a new concern for the alcoholic, a deeper appreciation of his problems, and the hope that the medical profession and the Christian Church may unite in seeking to use new methods which may abolish his suffering and despair. T. G. Dunning gives a scholarly examination of New Testament teaching on the use of alcohol, with practical application to the grave issues which confront us in the modern world.

In an interesting chapter he examines the various biblical references to intoxicating drink, but makes it plain that there is deeper significance in those great spiritual principles governing personal life and social responsibility which are so explicitly stated in the New Testament. There are valuable references to the social and personal issues involved, to medical and psychiatric treatment, to group therapy, and to the pronouncements on these matters by the various denominations. The book offers valuable material, in a refreshing and positive way, and should be read by those who are looking for another approach to the temperance question.

ALFRED BINNEY

An Analytic Philosophy of Religion, by William F. Zuurdeeg. (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$4.75.)

The sub-title of this book is 'a treatment of religion on the basis of humanitarian methods of empirical and existential philosophy'. The author relates how, under the German occupation, he was first forced to examine, then to reject, the doctrine of the Nazis; how he afterwards came into contact with the logical school of Vienna, and then went to the U.S.A., and stayed there. He is now an associate professor of the philosophy of religion at McCormick Theological Seminary. In this book he has set himself to describe the outlook of 'people' on life conviction, and the moral law. Does the philosophy of religion work? In the spirit of Vienna (though he modestly declines to speak for Wittgenstein or Carnap) he turns to language, what people say, as we suspect, in the conversations of students on the campus where their studies are helped out by their professors or by Roget's *Thesaurus*. But he cannot altogether neglect the great writers, Hume, Kant, and even Plato and Heidegger; along with Pradines, Hidding, Randall and Gustorf—names not yet familiar in this country. Everywhere he finds a tension between the analysis and the conviction: the main function of the former is to create distrust of metaphysics, ontology, and the 'cosmic conviction'. The latter we owe to the gnostics, with their idea of an integrated and purposive world. This, however, has been growing steadily weaker from the time of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment and the analysis of language—man is *homo loquens* and alas, often enough *pomposus* as well. The result is that God or the gods must be respectfully bowed out of the class-room, along with the crypto-theological views, which have knocked at doors too easily opened. A number of charts and diagrams suggest (not very lucidly) the blackboard. We cannot but wish that the author had found time for defining God and religion. Did not Socrates, pioneer of the analysis of what people say, aim at definitions? But we are assured in the last words of the book, that the author's philosophical analysis, though compatible with some forms of Protestantism, and several kinds of humanitarianism, has no place for fundamentalism, orthodoxy, older liberalism, all forms of metaphysics, communism, fascism and other totalitarianisms.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

Arthur Samuel Peake (1865-1929)—Essays in Commemoration and Selections from His Writings, edited by John T. Wilkinson. (Epworth Press, 21s.)

Peake and Primitive Methodism would be a title worthy of inclusion in the 'Teach Yourself History' series, for although his influence was by no means confined to Primitive Methodism and the training of its Ministry, for the last thirty-seven years of his life Peake was first and foremost a teacher at Hartley College. As such all students for the Primitive Methodist Ministry came under his influence. This is unusually significant in that he was able to guide a whole denomination through the stormy waters of a growing reassessment and deeper understanding of the Bible in light of the critical movement. Indeed, one who knew him well is quoted in this volume as writing shortly after his death: 'Perhaps it was Peake's greatest service,

not merely to his own communion but to the whole religious life of England, that he helped to save us from a fundamental controversy such as that which had devastated large sections of the Church in America.' Peake was able to speak to his students and his church both as a scholar who was thoroughly conversant with the facts and as a firm believer in Christ and the Christian religion. As a scholar he was of course in the first rank. At Oxford he read classics and theology and became a lecturer at Mansfield College and Fellow of Merton. In 1892 he moved to Hartley, and from 1904 until his death in 1929 played a leading part in the development of the University in Manchester as its first Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis. His primary task he conceived to be the mediation of the fruits and consequences of academic scholarship to 'ordinary' folk, and his editorship of the one-volume Bible Commentary was his outstanding achievement in this field. He scrutinized every word in this large tome. For what it sets out to do it remains the most useful of all such enterprises. In the present volume the Principal of Hartley-Victoria College has edited a collection of reminiscent essays on the various aspects of Peake's life and work, together with representative excerpts from his writings. The former include contributions from W. F. Lofthouse on Oxford Days, the late T. W. Manson on Manchester University, and A. Victor Murray on Peake as Author and Critic, while there are more personal and intimate accounts from W. E. Farndale, A. B. Hillis, Miss Elsie Cann (who was Peake's private secretary for twenty-five years), and L. S. Peake. The excerpts from Peake's writings include biblical essays and the enlarged Rylands lecture on 'The Quintessence of Paulinism', which many of Peake's former students had hoped he would one day expand into a major book on the apostle. While it is good to be reminded of the quality of Peake's work in this way, it is the reprint of the Presidential Address which he gave to the National Free Church Council in 1928 which makes the book doubly welcome, for here is a statement not readily available elsewhere. Peake spoke on the Reunion of the Christian Churches, and the address, as beautiful for its clarity as its charity, might well have been written for today's concerns. In his essay on 'Peake the Ecumenical Churchman', Principal Wilkinson has shown how deeply Peake cared for reunion, and with what persistent patience and skill he worked for Methodist union in his own denomination. While Peake loved the simplicity of Primitive Methodist worship at its best, the address brings out his devotion to the Church as the Body of Christ and how sympathetically he viewed its various traditions. He yearned for a Church in which every variety of organization and every type of worship congenial to our varied temperaments should find its legitimate home. 'Let us', he said, 'remind ourselves at the outset that our protests against positions we believe to be false, however necessary such protests may be, almost inevitably narrow us. We tend to push them into the centre instead of keeping them in their place.' Peake was by temperament and conviction a Free Churchman; all his life he was a layman. Yet like another son of the manse, B. L. Manning, few men have done more to remind their denominations of the high meaning of the Church and its Ministry. This volume is a welcome tribute to a great Christian scholar and churchman, who for a good many years was the distinguished editor of the *Holborn Review*. What is lacking is a critical estimate of Peake's theological work, but this was perhaps beyond its scope.

NORMAN P. GOLDHAWK

The Young Wesley—Missionary and Theologian of Missions, by Martin Schmidt.
Translated by L. A. Fletcher. (Epworth Press, 5s.)

Dr M. Schmidt, the Professor of Church History in the Kirchliche Hochschule, Berlin, is a Lutheran scholar who has made John Wesley his special study. His published writings include a thesis on Wesley's conversion, a number of articles in

periodicals, and the first volume of a life of Wesley. This booklet, which reads easily in translation, is based on material which is familiar to readers of the larger biography. It is devoted solely to the part which the missionary idea played in Wesley's thought and action. Dr Schmidt believes that this was quite central and fundamental to Wesley's whole position and later evangelical activity, which Wesley regarded as a continuation of the missionary impulse. A manuscript in the Herrnhut archives brings to light the interesting fact that, according to Peter Böhler, John Wesley would willingly have returned to Georgia as missionary to the Indians after his Aldersgate experience. But Professor Schmidt also analyses the content of Wesley's missionary idea, and this is a most valuable part of the argument. Wesley was no stranger to missionary ideals, which had played an important part in his early religious upbringing. But when he was really gripped by the idea as a result of John Burton's offer of Georgia he accepted the call in a way which lays bare his deepest motives. Wesley saw it as bound up with his conception of primitive Christianity, and Schmidt argues that he regarded the mission to the heathen as the way ordained for grasping the primal meaning of the Gospel. His missionary conception is contrasted with that of other agencies at the time, e.g. the religious societies, the Danish-Halle Mission, and that of the Puritans as represented by Richard Sibbes. The importance of this is that John Wesley and Methodism, 'which was formed under the banner of foreign missions', are seen as typical representatives of the 'modern' era. Schmidt argues that Wesley's missionary call arose directly from the dialectic of life in which unconditional obedience to an external authority, e.g. the written word of Scripture, has given place to a task taken up with fervour from inner necessity, because the Word of God is linked to a concrete, real-life situation. Here is material for fruitful reflection. It is vital for modern Methodism to see Wesley's emphasis upon sanctification in the light of his missionary activity, and to understand that Wesley only responded to the missionary call when he understood it, not as the act of an individual but as the work of a community of several men, in which the Church, not the preacher, evangelizes. This includes the 'living out' of the Gospel by the Church as community and brotherhood. In both of these convictions are found essential 'notes' of Methodism at its truest and best.

NORMAN P. GOLDHAWK

John Wesley and the Catholic Church, by John M. Todd. (Hodder & Stoughton, 15s.)
Look Back in Love, by Beatrice Hawker. (Longmans, 15s.)

These two books have only one thing in common, but that one thing is not lacking in importance: they are each written by a Roman Catholic; and, indeed, Mr Todd's study of John Wesley's theology carries the *imprimatur*. Unlike many non-Methodist writers, Mr Todd appears to be familiar with the source-books. For the biographical details of Wesley's life he has relied upon the *Journal* and upon Tyerman (it is strange how Tyerman still holds the field for the 'outsider'); he is well acquainted with the *Works*; whilst Charles Wesley's hymns afford him as much enjoyment and inspiration as though he were a Methodist. The author's aim is twofold: to describe the inspiration which was the motive-power, not only of Wesley, but also of Methodism through two hundred years; and to discover the extent to which that driving-force can be identified with that of the 'Catholic faith', and Wesley's doctrines with those of the Roman Catholic Church. It must be frankly stated that there is little in this book that is new to any reader familiar with the facts; its interest lies mainly in its author being a Romanist. It is inevitable that he should equate Rome with the 'Catholic' Church, but refreshing indeed that he should evidence such a deep respect for the founder of Methodism, even to the extent (it would seem) of wishing to claim him as a Roman Catholic. Two interesting points emerge. First, Mr Todd's comparison of Wesley with St John of the Cross; and here we must confess that we find

the lengthy quotations from *The Dark Night of the Soul*, in relation to Wesley's pre-conversion spiritual struggles, entirely unconvincing. Second, it is good to find that at last Wesley has found a Roman Catholic champion to defend him against the trenchant criticisms in Ronald Knox's *Enthusiasm*. Mr Todd deals faithfully with the psychological effects of Wesley's preaching, his 'subjectivity', and his doctrine of assurance, and thereby he will have done much to counteract the unfavourable view of Wesley which was popularized amongst Roman Catholics by Knox's book. At the same time he has conclusively demonstrated the Roman 'orthodoxy' of many of Wesley's beliefs, though whether that will be a palatable revelation to many modern Methodists is open to question. We have travelled a long way since Wesley wrote *Popery Calmly Considered* and Bishop Lavington published *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compar'd*. Mr Todd is in the succession of Father Maximin Piette and Arnold Lunn, and we may hope that his appreciation of Wesley is a favourable sign of the times. His approach is inevitably partisan, but it is nevertheless truly eirenic and ecumenical, and though his closing paragraphs may cause many Methodist eyebrows to lift, we cannot but be grateful for the spirit that inspired them: 'A Catholic believes that every man who has followed his conscience will find himself eventually in heaven. . . . As I have come to know Wesley I have believed him to be there and have prayed to God through him—not publicly as the Church prays through those declared to be saints—but privately as I pray for and to those who have been close to me.'

Mrs Beatrice Hawker, unlike Mr Todd, is a convert to Roman Catholicism. She was born in a Methodist home in the West Country, baptized by a minister who is a frequent contributor to the pages of this journal, and became a local preacher. The reasons for her conversion to Rome remain obscure, but unlike some who leave one branch of Christendom for another, Mrs Hawker has nothing but gratitude for all that Methodism gave her of knowledge, experience, friendships, and opportunities of service. Indeed, she confesses that 'if it had not been for them and the blessing of their love and friendship, I should probably have been lost altogether in outer darkness'. No book was ever given an apter title; it breathes the spirit of a divine charity, and to one reader at least it has brought a deep refreshment of soul. Mrs Hawker was born in 1910: many of her girlhood ministers and friends are still alive, though their identity is carefully concealed. Her descriptions of village Methodism, its quaint customs and even quainter personalities, make delightful reading and sometimes provoke a sensation of nostalgia. Her knowledge of modern Methodism is not always up to date: she is unaware, for instance, that we have left the 'three years' system' far behind us, and naïvely states that the lay pastors are usually more evangelistic than the ministers! However, these and other slight errors are minor blemishes in a book which cannot fail to give infinite pleasure to Methodists and non-Methodists alike. Nothing in this book has moved the present reviewer more than its warm appreciation of Alfred E. Whitham, of sainted memory, who was my superintendent and dear friend thirty years ago. Whitham was Mrs Hawker's hero. Though she read his religious articles avidly, she heard him only once: 'Whatever the reason, he was not at his best, but it didn't matter. I had seen him; and, after that, behind the printed page shone the gleaming white hair and the burning dark eyes of the man himself.' Those who knew and loved Whitham (and their name is legion) will buy and treasure this book for that one page alone. WESLEY F. SWIFT.

An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament, by Alan Richardson. (S.C.M. Press, 30s.)

'The Word was God. . . . And the Word became flesh.' Perhaps the greatest service rendered by Dr Richardson in this important book is to have taken seriously, and to

have treated explicitly, the significance of this foundation article of the Christian faith for the meaning of Theo-logy. In a Preface, which ranks in its own right as a distinguished contribution to the subject, he defines New Testament theology as 'the framing of an hypothesis concerning the content and character of the faith of the apostolic Church, and the testing of this hypothesis in the light of all available techniques of New Testament scholarship. . . .' Let it be said at once that in the substance of his book, Dr Richardson endorses the right, already justified in his previous works, to speak about 'all available techniques'. Few men are more competent to deal with and comment on the work of contemporary theologians in the many fields of scholarship. He goes on to point out that while New Testament theology, according to his definition, cannot *prove* hypotheses, it can *test* them. It cannot prove an hypothesis to be true; but it is always possible to show that one hypothesis is better than another. What then is the one hypothesis of Dr Richardson's argument? It is that *Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant re-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation which is found in the New Testament, and that the events of the life, 'signs', passion and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the 'data' of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current today.* We have moved far from the 'Paul the perverter of the simple Gospel' school. Beyond even the 'Paul the first interpreter of Jesus' view. Jesus Himself is the greatest theologian of them all. This has needed saying, and working out, for a long time. The defence of the hypothesis is carried out in sixteen chapters beginning with a study of faith 'since apart from faith the inward meaning of the New Testament is unintelligible', and covering the great creedal themes. Dr Richardson has studied and weighed the views of other scholars. In one way or another he is debtor to many, but he relies on none. Pursuing in general the middle of the road, he is critical, usually by implication, of extremes on either side. On points of detail we may often wish for a second opinion. To the present reviewer there appears to be one serious omission. Rather less than justice seems to have been done to the New Testament doctrine of man—a doctrine of crucial importance in the modern world, and about which Jesus says and implies much more than that with which He is usually credited in the 'text-books'. Such criticism must not be allowed to lessen admiration and gratitude for a remarkable achievement. Here is a book of rare clarity and comprehensiveness which, as Dr Richardson desiderates for a sound hypothesis, *makes sense*. It is not for armchair reading, but will remain in use for a very long time as a tool to hand on the study desk. We cannot leave it without giving the publisher his meed of praise. The book, of nearly a quarter of a million words with five splendid indices, is splendidly printed and bound. To have done this at the price charged is an achievement worthy of the substance.

MARCUS WARD

Theology of the Old Testament, by E. Jacob. (Hodder & Stoughton, 30s.)

This volume is a translation, welcome indeed, by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock, of *Theologie de l'Ancien Testament*, by Professor Edmond Jacob of Strasbourg, published in 1955. It calls attention to the religious ideas which dominate the Old Testament literature and constitute its fundamental unity. Introductory chapters deal with the history of Old Testament Theology, and its relations with other Old Testament studies and with other theological studies. The author does not omit to point out that theological intention is present as far back as the earliest of the sources of the Pentateuch, and also that the New Testament is really a theology of the Old, 'for its essential purpose is to show that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ . . . to whom all Scripture bears witness'. The first main section of the book is concerned with the nature of God. Jacob affirms that the fundamental distinctive Israelite idea of the Deity is that he is a *living* God, and it is of great interest to observe how, not

only in this part but throughout the volume, he sets forth the important teachings of the Old Testament about God, early and late, as the unfolding, as it were, of what is contained in that concept. In the Hebrew Scriptures, holiness, righteousness, faithfulness, love, designate qualities which cannot be satisfactorily explained merely by considering what these terms represented in the non-Israelite world. They are something more; and the secret of their uniqueness lies in Israel's peculiar perception of the 'living-ness' of its God. In Part II the Old Testament teaching regarding the action of the Living God is surveyed; the chapters are on God's instruments, Creation, the nature and destiny of Man, God as lord of history, and God in institutions. Part III is entitled 'Opposition to and Final Triumph of God's Work', and in this section Sin and Redemption, Death and the Future Life, and the Consummation are dealt with (though somewhat briefly). There is a valuable bibliography after each chapter. Professor Jacob's treatment of his subject, especially his main theme of the Living God, is impressive, stimulating, and indeed inspiring. The idea of the God who is really and fully *alive* (in contrast with the innumerable deities of ancient times whose activity was limited by their connexion with the processes of nature, or with the fortunes of particular peoples) is quite fascinating. It is simple enough to have appeared as a distinctive belief among an undeveloped people at a very early date, but it is profound. Amid the change and challenge of history, Israel's God was never outgrown—as the gods of many nations were. The present reviewer, as one who has long been convinced of the importance of the Living God belief, is grateful to see the theme so brilliantly worked out in this book. The proofs of Professor Jacob's industrious scholarship appear on almost every page. The book is the product of a vast amount of thorough work. The religious ideas of the Old Testament are carefully classified and attractively presented. Frequently one is intrigued and stimulated by the illustration of a doctrine by means of a Scripture quotation which had never occurred to one in that connexion. Occasionally one has a feeling that this kind of thing has been somewhat overdone. Is it necessary to quote Exodus 4₁₋₇ in order to illustrate Israel's belief in the wrath of Yahweh? The point can surely be made without that fragment of barbarous legend. But such things are small matters indeed seen against so much solid excellence as the book reveals. J. Y. MUCKLE

The Latter Prophets, by T. Henshaw. (Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

Books on Hebrew prophecy, or on a prophet or prophets, are well-nigh 'as the sand which is by the seashore innumerable', but among the vast host of them there will always be room for such a volume as this. Mr Henshaw set out, as he tells us in his preface, to present to the reader the writings of the Latter Prophets viewed in the light of modern scholarship, and he has succeeded splendidly. Those who undertake with him the fairly lengthy journey he has planned—there are well over 300 pages—will find that the road is good, that the signposts and danger signals are distinctly marked, and, above all, that he is an admirable companion and guide; and they will come to the end of the way surprised that the time has passed so quickly. The early chapters are concerned with the nature of the prophetic literature, historical and archaeological background, the rise of prophecy and the character of Hebrew poetry. The remainder of the book deals with the prophets themselves, a chapter being devoted to each; here an analysis of the contents of the book under consideration is given, and the rest of the material is clearly and conveniently arranged under such headings as 'Life and Character of the Prophet', 'Permanent Influence', 'Style'. The subject of Prophecy is, of course, an enormous one, and there is imperative need for condensation in a one-volume treatment of it; but Mr Henshaw's scholarship is matched by his ability to write clear and attractive English. He rarely uses two words where one will do, and it is safe to say that no important matter has been left

unmentioned. The reasons for the generally accepted conclusions of Old Testament criticism are plainly stated. On disputed questions the author has sometimes been content to set out briefly the various theories, without indicating his own view; on the occasions when he does express his judgement regarding such matters it impresses the reader as being thoroughly sound. Appendices on subjects like the Priesthood, Sacrifice and the Messianic Hope are a valuable addition to the book. The whole work is an excellent example of what can be achieved by that reverent but scientific examination of the Prophetic literature which is the only satisfactory treatment of it today. Mr Henshaw's book often succeeds in making the prophets very real and human; and just because they are so clearly portrayed they stand out before us not merely as men, but as men of God.

J. Y. MUCKLE

Church Dogmatics: IV, The Doctrine of Reconciliation; Part 2, by Karl Barth. Translated by Dr G. W. Bromilry. (T. & T. Clark, 55s.)

This second part of Volume IV, 'Reconciliation', deals with Jesus the Reconciler predominantly as King; although it must be admitted that the royal character of Jesus the Reconciler is not specially present. The whole book is given up to Chapter XV, 'Jesus Christ, the Servant as Lord'; the Exaltation of the Son of Man, the Sloth and Misery of Man, the Satisfaction of Man, the Holy Spirit and the Upbuilding of the Christian Community, the Holy Spirit and Christian Love. The book has all the characteristics the reader will have found in earlier volumes; to which Barth can apparently set no limits; and the freedom with which Barth can pass from one aspect of this subject to another, or from one subject to another outright. Clearly it is a book, like its predecessors, intended for the desk, and not for the pew; but it is hard not to be irritated by the ease with which the author appeals for support, now to the letter of Scripture, interpreted as he chooses to interpret it; now to the dogmas of a church; now to the author's private conviction. Taking it for all in all, the book is no seminary treatment on reconciliation. Neither 'atonement' nor 'punishment' appears in the index, nor is 'sacrifice' mentioned save casually. There is no reference to the great patristic doctrines of the Church; no Luther and Calvin are seriously discussed. In fact, Barth writes almost as if he were the first that ever burst into that silent sea. The whole drama begins with the pitying love of God for man in his misery and stupidity, worked out by the appeal of His self-humiliation. Barth is not afraid of speaking of the death of God. But it cannot be denied that this monumental work of Karl Barth is in danger of leading us in the wrong direction, like so many of his predecessors. The reconciliation of God must invade the heart before it satisfies the head. 'He loved ME; He gave Himself for ME.' The Unitarian John Bowring wrote: 'In the cross of Christ I glory'; whatever the actual meaning to him of those noble words. Whatever its weakness, Forsyth's work *The Cruciality of the Cross* moves us more deeply than Barth's volume on Dogmatics. The chapel is a more important place than the lecture hall or the examination room. But Barth moves us neither to an '*O altitudo*' nor a '*sed quid invenientibus?*' 'Anselm, Aquinas, Luther, Maurice, Moberly, Lidgett—the Church has needed them all.' It is not less hard thinking we miss, but more. But let us take as our last example of a work which calls in every section for some praise, the distinction which the author works out, on a strictly ethical basis, between the Christian *agape* which goes out and asks for nothing in return, and the non-Christian love, *eros*, which, consciously or unconsciously, is still thinking of the return to be made, even if only at the last, by the object of the *eros*. Here Barth would have a regiment of poets to face him, first and foremost, perhaps, Robert Browning's 'By the Fireside', seconded by the experience of hundreds of husbands and wives, parents and children, and especially by that of the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the foundation of whose

religion lay in the *berith* or covenant or 'leal love' of the two parties. So, over each succeeding volume, Barth may whisper his '*exegi monumentum*', tempest-buffed, citadel-crowned. Heaven grant to none of his readers, to murmur, 'the city sparkles like a grain of salt'.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

From My New Shelf

BY R. NEWTON FLEW

The Meeting of Love and Knowledge, by Martin C. D'Arcy (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). It is likely that we shall be hearing much more about the great religions of the East, and books are already pouring in to expound their tenets. We could not have a more acute and learned exponent of the issues raised than Father D'Arcy. In this book the first of the five chapters is '*Homo sapiens*'. It is the term which zoologists use for the highest of the mammals; but 'the word *sapiens* is also the proper description for man at his highest'. After this statement of 'an affinity between the cave-men of Altamira and a Plato or a Newton', we are all alert for an inspiring cruise. The second chapter is 'Wisdom and Mysticism', and disentangles the Buddhist and Hindu descriptions of love from the Christian (pp.44-8). The third chapter ('Eastern and Western Mysticism') brings us to the provisional conclusion that there are three forms of mystical experience: one which can be called nature mysticism, a second solitary mysticism, 'and the third, Christian, based on knowledge and love which moves in the circuit of persons and personal love'. Father D'Arcy is a master of style, and he is at his picturesque best in the fourth chapter, 'The Divine Union and the Self'. The difficulty for us lies in this: most of the texts of the Hindu and Buddhist literature appear to require the disappearance of the self, in Nirvana. But Father D'Arcy calls to witness the Hindu scholar and mystic, Sri Aurobindo, who eschews the negation of the value of the human soul, and tries to meet modern science on its own ground (p.151). This book is not for beginners, and needs more than one reading. For generosity of outlook, the author can well stand with Sri Aurobindo, whom he admires.

Man's Knowledge of God, by William J. Wolf (Gollancz, 12s. 6d.). This is an admirable book to put into the hands and minds of theological students. The author is a professor at the Episcopal Theological Seminary in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and has served as Director of the Laymen's Institute at Bossey. He is a devoted servant of the Ecumenical Movement. After 'The Search for God Today', the second chapter shows 'Where Christians find God', and the third is the 'Place of the Old Testament as Preparation'. The fourth chapter contains in brief compass the heart of the book. The chapters which follow are: (V) 'Revelation and History', (VI) 'Revelation and Faith' ('Luther has said that just as everyone must do his own dying, so everyone must do his own believing'), (VII) 'Jesus Christ and Revelation' ('God does take the initiative and come to human need without insisting that man should first fulfil certain conditions of righteousness. . . . This is the burden of Jesus's teaching about God. Then is it such a violent transition to believe that he who gives such teaching about God is also the human embodiment of just such a God?' (p.91). Chapter VIII (Revelation and Redemption) is closely linked to the factual argument of Chapter VII, as it is with Chapter IX ('The New Testament Church') and

Chapter X ('The Church and Its Understanding of Revelation'). The final three chapters are concerned with 'that other knowledge that man has through reason', and about the knowledge disclosed in the religions of mankind. Professor Wolf does not falter in his closing chapters. 'One of the more obvious conclusions . . . is that intellectual problems are not the overwhelming ones. The greater difficulties centre round the recalcitrance of the self' (p.186).

Scriptural Holiness, by Robert Rayle (Comet Press, New York, via Epworth Bookshop, \$3.50). This little book (110 pages) is by a minister who has spent most of his days in the 'active work' in the state of Indiana. He opens with the crisp sentence: 'Holiness is a universal concept.' He uses that fact to argue: if universal, therefore fundamental, at least for both 'Jews and Greeks'. The first chapter is devoted to definition of terms. It is good to see that he follows in the footsteps of Principal N. H. Snaith for his definitions, and that he uses the work of Wheeler Robinson and Otto J. Baab in his subsequent discussion. In the third chapter, which is the longest, he studies the 'Concept of Holiness in the New Testament'. To understand Paul, he uses not only Protestant and Jewish, but also Roman Catholic commentaries. In Chapter 4, on 'Modern Holiness', he uses seven propositions, which he thinks would be accepted by most of the Protestant teachers (p.93). But the hopeful and joyous sign is this evidence that the Holiness doctrine is taken seriously in the U.S.A., and is being placed first in the Fernley-Hartley Lecture by the foremost administrator of the Methodist Church in this country.

Inside Methodist Union, by James Straughn (Abingdon Press, via Epworth Bookshop, \$3.00). The author speaks with special authority on the union which took place twenty years ago in American Methodism. The uniting bodies were the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal South, and also the Methodist Protestant Church. The author himself was the last President of the Conference of the Methodist Protestants, and has been their first Bishop. As far as an English student can judge, this book will be indispensable to all who work at American Church history. Those who formed the body called Methodist Protestants in 1830 took their stand on the principle that laymen must share equally with ministers both the legislation and administration. Thus the Methodist Protestants anticipated by nearly half a century the action of the Wesleyan Methodists in Great Britain in 1878. As for his own country, the Bishop has the seemingly innocent remark: 'It took the Northern and Southern churches eighty years to discover and to give reluctant admission to laymen into the general councils of the churches' (p.156).

Preaching: The Art of Communication, by L. J. Tizard (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.). This book will be invaluable to theological students and young preachers, who were especially in Mr Tizard's mind during his last illness. Dr Leslie Cooke writes an affectionate Foreword, and Chapter I relates what Mr Tizard justly describes as 'something of a nightmare'. It was his interview with Principal P. T. Forsyth. He was the last student admitted to college by that very great man. But if my reader is not all keenness now to buy or borrow the book, I am very sorry for him. On p.76 we read a dreadful warning which, I fear, is still needed: 'We must not claim as our own experiences which are actually second-hand.'

Men of Wisdom Series (Longmans, 6s. each). (1) *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition*, by Jean Steinman. This book has been admirably translated from the French by Michael Boyes, and shows us how the latest discoveries in the desert are illuminating the background of the birth of Christianity. The author builds up a theory that John the Baptist was once a member of the order of the Essenes, but left them before he had taken the final oath. The extracts from Philo, the elder Pliny and Josephus, we knew before. But the extracts from the *Manual of Discipline* are fresh, and there are other suggestions which deserve examination. (2) *Buddha*

and *Buddhism*, by Maurice Percheron. Translated by E. Stapleton. The author was given the almost impossible task of compressing twenty-five centuries into five chapters and 55,000 words. There is a wealth of illustrations, all of them bringing the contemplative life of the East before our eyes. There is a closing chapter on Buddhist art, a Chronological Table, a Glossary, a Bibliography containing a list of the most important books in the last sixty years. And the whole is written with the clarity which we expect from a book written by a French author and translated into English to match. What more could the student want? (3) *Muhammad and the Islamic Tradition*, by Emile Dermenghem, translated from the French by Jean M. Watt. This little book is a triumph of compression. To begin at the end: there are four pages of dates, variegated by admirable pictures which take off the bitter feeling about dates. Seventy-five pages at least are devoted to pictures, three to the Bibliography. Fifty pages are given to the life of Muhammad, and thirty-seven to the Islamic tradition. Very welcome are the selections of texts from both Qur'an and Traditions; also extracts from Ibn Khaldun, on whose place in the 'philosophy of culture' Dr J. W. Sweetman has an important review in our issue of October 1957. Altogether this little book is fair, attractive, and sparkling with the best of Islam. There is another side which I saw in glimpses when I was a sojourner in Iraq and Persia for eighteen months in the twenties.

Five new Pelicans: (1) *Body and Mind in Western Thought*, by Joan Wy. Reeves (5s.). In this attractively written introduction to the history of the subject, young students of psychology will find an invaluable gift. Part 1 begins with the Early Greeks and proceeds *via* Classical Greece and Rome, through St Augustine, St Anselm, and St Thomas to Petrarch and the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In Part 2, 'The Thinkers Speak for Themselves', extracts from the works of these thinkers are included. Yes, an indispensable book, both for the student of psychology and for the persons who haven't had his advantages. (2) *The Human Situation*, by W. Macneile Dixon (5s.). This book is a reprint of one of the most popular and attractive set of Gifford Lectures. There is something brilliant or startling on almost every page. (3) *The Theory of Evolution*, by J. Maynard Smith (3s. 6d.). What light has been thrown on the theories of Darwin and Wallace in the last hundred years? Special attention is given to the evidence that evolutionary changes are taking place in populations suddenly exposed to new conditions (pp.121-36). We can guess what our ancestors in 1858 would have said when confronted with these sentences: 'Half a million years ago man's ancestors first chipped stones to make simple tools. Less than ten thousand years ago, in the Neolithic revolution, animals and plants were first domesticated.' (4) *Human Groups*, by W. J. H. Sprott (3s. 6d.). This is a volume of the Pelican Psychology series, and is concerned with face-to-face relationships, such as the family, the village, 'working together'. It even promotes us before it ends to 'Crowds'. This is a book that every theological student should read. He would be sitting at the feet of an experienced modern teacher of sociology, and would be furnished with a mass of factual evidence. (5) *David Hume*, by A. H. Basson (3s. 6d.). The difficulty in the study of Hume is that we have two versions of his Epistemology on the one hand, and two versions of his moral philosophy on the other. His attitude to religion was one of the chief factors in all his philosophical thinking. His attitude was one of unqualified enmity. The religion of his boyhood was a grim form of Calvinism, emphasizing pre-election, guilt, damnation; and it made a deep impression on his mind (p.18). Mr Basson is a sure guide amid these perplexities. He shows his good judgement in his comment on Hume's denial that religious belief is essential for morality (p.112). 'He cites in his support various famous infidels who have been notably moral men. But the question is really much more complicated and difficult than he seems to think. It is, however, a factual, not a philosophical question.'

Two new Penguin poets: (1) *William Blake* (3s. 6d.). Blake's contemporaries did not understand him. This generation, nurtured upon modern poetry, should not find him difficult. He is at his best in the shorter poems. There pity mingles with gay bubbling laughter. Follow this attractively-bound volume whither it leads and you will find yourself in 'strange places cramm'd with observation'. (2) *W. H. Auden* (3s. 6d.). W. H. Auden is essentially a religious poet. He was in Spain during the Civil War. It was there that his 'religious conversion' took place. For him political and social reform are not enough. 'We must love one another or die', says he in summing up his wartime experiences. His erudition and his allusiveness make his poems difficult to read, but for those who will persevere the reward is sure.

The Christian Life, by H. R. Haworth (Stockwell, Ilfracombe, 9s. 6d.). This book is a sequel to *The Christian Faith*, and is a suitable companion for it. It is simple, and does not assume too much. There is a very welcome section at the end of the book which is timely and unusual. 'The true Christian should work as a Christian at his or her daily job, regarding it both as a means of serving the community as a whole, and even more important as an act of service to God.' There are six pages at the end about service in missions overseas. Mr Haworth makes no mention of what William Temple called the great new fact of our time—the Ecumenical Movement, the World Council of Churches. There are prayers in which even Roman Catholics are allowed to join, in the same week with us, and the services in which the Orthodox Eastern Churches are actually joining with us, in living presence when great Conferences meet.

The Doctor: The Story of John Stansfeld of Oxford and Bermondsey, by Barclay Baron (Wyvern Books, Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). The author makes his peace immediately with his Methodist readers, for whom Dr Lidgett would be the only doctor in Bermondsey. But as the little son of the vicarage in the *Punch* cartoon saw clearly, there is a distinction between Daddy, recently awarded the D.D., and 'the doctor who makes people better'. Both Lidgett and Stansfeld were born in 1854. John Scott Lidgett arrived in Bermondsey in 1890; John Stansfeld in 1897. Lidgett was awarded his highly-prized honorary distinction of D.D. at Aberdeen in 1903. Stansfeld was 'making people better' every day from his arrival in Bermondsey till his departure in 1912 to St Ebbes. He was the first Warden of the Oxford Medical Mission in Bermondsey, a work begun by three Oxford friends in prayer at Wycliffe Hall. This is a most delightful book. But the most moving paragraph is in the Foreword, describing his character: 'In his presence life was always brought to a glowing heat of enthusiasm (in its proper sense of God-given reality): he radiated the immediacy of God's claim and the insistence of God's love; he embraced everyone in the eager charity of his own heart, and compelled them to share in his single-minded service of God and man.' The author of that paragraph signs himself Geoffrey Cantuar.

Westcott's St John, with an Introduction by Adam Fox (James Clarke, 18s. 6d.). This famous commentary (1881) is not outdated yet. Why not? Because it is a theological treatise of the highest rank. Amid the most brilliant commentaries which have been published since on the Fourth Gospel, Westcott and Sir Edwyn Hoskyns are supreme because they recognize that between the Synoptic narratives and the Fourth Gospel lies the experience of an organized Christian society. There was 'need of the long teaching of time that His disciples had implicitly received'. Westcott's volume and his other books, together with Lightfoot on Galatians, served as 'systematic theology' for the generation of Anglicans who lived in the shadows of controversies about gesture, vesture, and posture (the phrase was used sixty years ago by a Low Churchman, Richard Lee).

Citadel, Market and Altar Outline of Socionomy, the New Natural Science of Society, by Spencer Heath (The Science of Society Foundation, Inc., 1502 Montgomery

Road, Baltimore, *via* Epworth Bookshop, \$6). The optimism of this author knows no bounds! His age is eighty-two. He received his degrees in law and practised in Washington. He is an expert in mechanical, hydraulic, and civil engineering. About 70 per cent. of the propellers used by American planes in World War I came from his factory. He comes of Quaker stock. He was able to retire in 'early middle life'. A friend of his says: 'Maybe he doesn't allow enough for Original Sin.' Aye! There's the rub! His definition of human beings (p.216) is that they are endowed with a spiritual and creative power that gives them dominion over the whole earth and makes them the 'children of God'. Faithful as this description seems to the Beatitudes, it is followed on the next page by the words: 'Salvation from evil is not any advance, but only a salvage at the best, for it does not enter into the progression of the divine.' Life's real business is to flow forward in forms transcending all its past, to the persuasions of beauty, and 'they are so far exempt from the rude compulsions of animal life'. This is far from the Christian conceptions of salvation and sanctity. The saints are never distant from a hill called Calvary.

The Office of Lord High Commissioner, by Stewart Mechie; with a Foreword by the Duke of Hamilton (St Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 10s. 6d.). Since the end of the seventeenth century, the Assembly has met every year; to every meeting a Royal Commissioner has been sent. The Lecturer in Church History in Glasgow University has written the history of this unique office. I began the reading of it from a sense of that stern lawgiver, Duty, and the duty became a delight. Take the Foreword. The Duke conducts us into the Throne Room in St James's Palace, and shows us the Queen on 8th February 1952, two days after her accession, 'taking the Oath'. The booklet shows careful scholarship, and the author had the aid of Professor J. Pitt Watson, who first suggested to him the desirability of writing it. He it was who, addressing the Duke in 1953 at the closing of the Assembly, said what every true Scot should echo: 'This is the supreme court of a Church which is national and free, and your Grace's presence amongst us as Her Majesty's representative is the expression and declaration of a unique and historic achievement in the relationship of Church and State.'

The Art of Meditation, by Joel S. Goldsmith (Allen & Unwin, 9s. 6d.). This is the third book by Mr Goldsmith. He claims to have studied in the last thirty years the major religions and philosophies of all ages, to have discovered the secret height of spiritual experience in the Song of Songs (p.147). One quotation must suffice: it is the Lord God speaking (p.146): 'Heretofore I have been within you, but now I *am* you—I think as you, I act as you; your consciousness and My consciousness are one and the same, because there is now only My consciousness.' Happy indeed is he who has learnt the dangers of pantheism.

The Pious Scientist, by James K. Feibleman (Bookman Associated, New York, 31 Union Square West, *via* Epworth Bookshop, \$3). This is certainly not the book for which we are all waiting. There is no discernible order in the beautifully printed pages. On p.109 we read: 'Do not ask for anything; prayer is a kind of unreasonable asking.' Some of us on both sides of the Atlantic live by the words: 'Ask and you shall receive; Seek and you shall find; knock, and the door will be opened.' There is no appeal to the Gospels. The Pious Scientist apparently has forgotten that there is a person called Jesus. He is not aware that in his final pages he is unconsciously echoing some of the prayers of Jesus. 'What more could one have the right to ask? To be saved from the world? No; emphatically not. But to be saved with the world we could legitimately hope for.' Did Mr Feibleman know that he was only echoing our Lord's words (John 3₁₆), 'God so loved the world that he gave . . .?'

Bishop and Presbytery: the Church of Scotland 1661-1688, by W. R. Foster (S.P.C.K., 25s.). The author has confined this study to 'The Second Episcopacy', and shows how

the Church combined in an unusual synthesis episcopal order with Calvinist doctrine and discipline. The result cannot surely be described as a lasting success. What shines out in this stormy period is the character of so many of the ministers (pp.118-21). 'We may conclude that a remarkably high standard of clerical life was maintained throughout the Restoration in Scotland.' Further proof is given in the chapter on 'Movements of Thought' (p.160). This volume is packed with fresh information extracted from the numerous historical clubs which flourished in Scotland in the last century. The author has fulfilled his hope of showing that this period (1661-1688) saw the beginning of a partial integration of presbyterianism and episcopacy.

NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Theology Today, October 1958.

Four articles on the Servant, by J. A. Mackay, R. Lennox, G. Johnston, P. L. Lehmann.

Contemporary Theology, by Nels Ferré.

The Trinity in Experience and Theology.

Interpretation, October 1958.

The Biblical Concept of Worship, by C. E. B. Cranfield.

The Problem of Human Suffering in the Old and New Testaments, by H. S. Tigner.

The Cup of Wrath, by G. A. F. Knight.

Review of Richard Niebuhr's *Resurrection and Historical Faith*, by Otto A. Piper.

Scottish Journal of Theology, December 1958.

Loyalty and Law in New Testament Times, by the Rev. R. S. Barbour.

Natural Theology and the Christian Faith, by Professor Nels Ferré.

Biblical Theology and Preaching, by Professor D. G. Miller.

The N.T. Doctrine of Election, by A. A. Solomon.

The Expository Times, October, November and December 1958.

With these three issues this famous monthly is launched on a new journey, and is well under way. There are three distinctive features:

The first is a discussion of the question, 'Science and Religion: Has the situation changed?' (two articles October and November), by Professor John McIntyre. [His conclusions are summarized in the sentence: 'If conflict and co-existence are no longer apposite words for the relation of science and religion, then conversation is undoubtedly the word that is.']

The second is 'Great Themes of the New Testament', by W. Barclay. The third is 'Milestones in Books', by Norman Snaith, Charles Raven, Leslie Mitton.

The International Review of Missions, October 1958.

The South African Church in the Light of 'IBADAN, 1958', by A. H. Zulu.

Worship in the Church of South India, by J. R. Macphail.

The Theological Education Fund, by C. W. Ranson.

The Journal of Politics, August 1958.

The Limits of Principle in International Politics; Necessity and the New Balance of Power, by Kenneth W. Thompson.

The Journal of Politics, November 1958.

The Immobility of the French Communist Party, by Roy C. Macridis.

A Poetic Approach to Politics; A Study in the Political Philosophy of George Santayana, by Robert Boynton.

Our Contributors

- | | |
|---|--|
| E. L. ALLEN
PH.D. (LONDON),
D.D. (ABERDEEN) | Presbyterian Minister. Warden of Arana Hall, Dunedin, New Zealand. Head of the Department of Divinity, King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1938-58. Visiting Professor, Andover Newton Theological School, Mass., 1957-8. |
| JOHN C. BOWMER
M.A., B.D. | Methodist minister. Author of <i>The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Early Methodism</i> . Journal Secretary of the Wesley Historical Society. Examiner in Wesley Studies, Ministerial Training; member of Studies Board and examiner in Christian Doctrine, Local Preachers' Committee. |
| RUPERT E. DAVIES
M.A., B.D. | Chaplain of Kingswood School from 1935-47. Tutor in Church History and the History of Doctrine at Didsbury College, Bristol, since 1952. Convener of the Faith and Order Committee of the Methodist Church. Author of <i>The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers, Reading your Bible, Why I am a Protestant, A Colony of Heaven</i> , etc. |
| R. NEWTON FLEW
M.A., D.D. | Moderator of Free Church Federal Council, 1945-6. President, Methodist Conference, 1946-7. Principal of Wesley House, Cambridge, 1937-55. Author and Editor of several theological books. |
| A. RAYMOND GEORGE
M.A., B.D. | Methodist Minister. Lamplough Tutor in Systematic and Pastoral Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds. Associate Lecturer, University of Leeds. Author of <i>Communion with God in the New Testament</i> . |
| A. S. GREGORY
M.A. | Kingswood School and Trinity College, Oxford; Methodist Minister since 1922. Member of editorial Committees, <i>Methodist Hymn-book</i> and <i>Methodist School Hymn-book</i> ; founder-member of the Methodist Sacramental Fellowship and Methodist Church Music Society. Author of <i>Praises with Understanding</i> . |
| PERCIVAL HADFIELD
M.A., B.D., PH.D., F.R.A.I. | Vicar of Youlgreave, Derbyshire. Author of two books on Anthropology, <i>The Savage and his Totem</i> and <i>Traits of Divine Kingship in Africa</i> . |
| BERNARD E. JONES
M.A., B.D. | Methodist Minister, Lewins Tutor in Philosophy, Hartley Victoria College, Manchester. |
| JAMES A. MICHIE
M.A. | Educated Aberdeen University and Balliol College, Oxford. Flying Officer with R.A.F. during second World War: served in the Middle East, Italy, India, and Burma. At present Lecturer in English at Aberdeen University. |
| E. BENSON PERKINS
M.A., LL.D. | President Methodist Conference, 1948-9, Vice-President, British Council of Churches, 1952-4, Moderator Free Church Federal Council, 1954-5. Joint-Secretary, World Methodist Council since 1951. Author, <i>Gambling in English Life</i> , etc. |
| PERCY SCOTT
B.D., D. THEOL. | Now Tutor in Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Hartley Victoria College, University of Manchester. Studied in Germany and holds a doctorate at Marburg. In his Circuits a leader in the evangelism of youth. |
| JOHN STACEY
B.D. | Methodist Minister. |
| VINCENT TAYLOR
D.D., PH.D., F.B.A. | Tutor, Headingley College, Leeds (Ferens Chair of New Testament Language and Literature, and Classics). Author of <i>The Gospels: A Short Introduction, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching</i> , etc. |

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

SAINTS ALIVE!

The Methodist Lent Book, 1959

By Canon Bryan Green

This book is intended for the ordinary man who wants to know something of what it means to be a Christian and to lead the Christian life. Thoughtful people have a right to be told what is implied in the demands of Christian discipleship before they are asked to make their surrender to Christ.

Paper covers, 5s. net

Boards, 7s. 6d. net

THE ASTONISHING YOUTH

A study of John Wesley as men saw him

By Dr Maldwyn Edwards

This is not one more life of Wesley, but a portrait of the man himself. So often he has been misrepresented as austere, despotic and unlovable. In this book the real man emerges as possessing both strength and attractiveness, one whose easy charm was felt by friend and critic alike.

10s. 6d. net

THIS JESUS

By Eric G. Frost, B.A., B.D.

This book has been written in plain, non-technical language to introduce the layman to a deeper understanding of the Person of Jesus Christ. It is for the Christian who is disturbed by uncertainties about the Person of our Lord; it treats the subject reverently and constructively, and with a note of challenge.

10s. 6d. net

HE SENT LEANNESS

By David Head, M.A.

Here is a book of prayers with a difference. It invites us to eavesdrop on our times of prayer, to examine the things we ask for and desire. It uncovers some of the false images and wrong attitudes in which we are all apt to indulge. 'For anyone who can spare six shillings and be ready to laugh—then think—this book should be a "must". But don't misunderstand its purpose—it's meant to hurt as well as amuse. Yes, and shock it will.'—*Church of England Newspaper*.

6s. net

THE CLUE TO ROME

Introduction to a City

By Reginald Kissack, M.A.

Illustrated by George Reid

This is the only book on Rome that tells of 2,700 years in 27,000 words, traces a single Living Idea through them all, and lets places explain the idea. It is written for the THREE-DAY TOURIST who wants not just to see the City, but to understand it.

8s. 6d. net

THE GLORIOUS COMPANY

Lives of Great Christians for Daily Devotion

By Frederick C. Gill, M.A.

Vol. I: January-June

In a world of scientific nightmare it is a great refreshment to turn to the lives of the Saints, who reflect the glory of God, and show the immense and exhilarating possibilities of human nature when committed into His hands. This anthology brings together many of the best known of that great company.

10s. 6d. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

NEW EPWORTH BOOKS

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF THE HEREAFTER

By C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.

The series of works by Dr Ryder Smith on various Bible doctrines is well known and widely used. Shortly before his death he completed the typescript of this, the last of them, a volume which, in its general approach, resembles its predecessors, and in its qualities of careful scholarship and balanced judgement is worthy of a place beside them.

30s. net

MAN IN COMMUNITY

By Russell P. Shedd, M.A., B.D., Ph.D.

This is a study of St Paul's applications of Old Testament and early Jewish conceptions of Human Solidarity. No earlier work has treated the subject so comprehensively.

30s. net

HEIRS TO RESPONSIBILITY

By Alfred C. Lamb, M.A., B.D., B.Sc., Ph.D.

'Wrought to apostleship'—the phrase is St Paul's. He used it to describe St Peter. But Peter was not the only one to be so forged by God. Ten others underwent the same experience. When it was over God could transfer to their shoulders the responsibility for proclaiming His Saving Will and Word which had lain on the shoulders of Jesus.

10s. 6d. net

A PREACHER'S PRAYER BOOK

By Clement H. Pugsley

Free prayer is a wonderful gift of God to His Church, but every worshipper knows how sadly this gift can be abused. This book is an attempt to meet the needs of those who, called to lead the people in public worship, are anxious to make the prayers a real and living part of the service.

8s. 6d. net

THE CONCEPT OF GRACE

Essays on the Way of Divine Love in Human Life

By Philip S. Watson, M.A., B.D.

The word 'grace', already current in classical and Hellenistic Greek, received a great enrichment of meaning in the New Testament. In the course of Christian history this meaning has not infrequently been obscured and even debased, though it has never been wholly lost.

10s. 6d. net

THE EPWORTH PRESS

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1